

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 671

HE 002 422

AUTHOR Albrecht, W. P., Ed.
TITLE Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities (22nd, Montreal, October 22-23, 1970).
INSTITUTION Association of Graduate Schools.
PUB DATE 71
NOTE 113p.
AVAILABLE FROM Dean W.P. Albrecht, The Graduate School, The University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66044 (\$2.50)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$6.58
DESCRIPTORS *Conference Reports, Educational Change, *Educational Finance, *Graduate Study, *Higher Education, *Teaching Assistants
IDENTIFIERS *Association of Graduate Schools

ABSTRACT

The addresses and committee reports presented at the meeting of the Association of Graduate Schools include: (1) an editorial by W. Donald Cooke on the confusion over the direction graduate education should be taking; (2) a report by the President, Bryce Crawford, who feels that graduate admission must be highly selective and graduate instruction should remain at a high, "undiluted" level; (3) a report by the Committees on Federal Relations and on Communications with the Public; (4) reports of panel discussions on teaching assistants and on changes needed in graduate education; (5) reports of roundtable discussions on: the Doctor of Arts degree, post-baccalaureate education, minority group students, student financial aid and Federal support, employment of Ph.D's, and financial and academic aspects of the teaching assistant; and (6) reports of the Committees on Testing, Membership, International Education, Computers in Graduate Education, and Policies in Graduate Education. The remainder of the Proceedings is devoted to Association business, and lists the Deans and mailing addresses of member institutions. (AF)

HE042 422

Twenty-second Annual Conference

Montreal — October 22-23, 1970

ED0 53671

Journal of
Proceedings and
Addresses
of the Association of
Graduate Schools
in the Association
of American
Universities

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY.

JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES

Journal of Proceedings and Addresses
of the
Twenty-second Annual Conference
of the
Association of Graduate Schools
in the
Association of American Universities

MONTREAL, QUEBEC, CANADA, 22-23 OCTOBER 1970

W. P. Albrecht, Editor

OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
LAWRENCE, KANSAS

Copies of preceding issues of
the *Journal of Proceedings* may
be obtained from
Dean W. P. Albrecht
The Graduate School
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Price: \$2.50 per copy, prepaid

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE	vii
DELEGATES AND GUESTS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE	1
AN EDITORIAL: <i>A Turning Point</i> Dean W. Donald Cooke	4
REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT: <i>The Reasons Why</i> Dean Bryce Crawford, Jr.	5
REPORT ON FEDERAL RELATIONS Dr. Lloyd G. Humphreys	8
Dr. Charles V. Kidd	14
REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC Dean D. C. Spriestersbach	20
Dr. George Arnstein	21
Mr. C. David Cornell	24
PANEL DISCUSSIONS <i>Our Junior Officers of Instruction</i> Dean Ian C. Loram, Dean Francis M. Boddy, Dean Elmer F. Baumer, Dean C. W. Minkel	32
<i>Time for Change</i> Mr. C. W. Cook, Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, Dean George Winchester Stone, Jr., Dean W. Gordon Whaley	51
REPORT ON LUNCHEON DISCUSSIONS Dean Irwin W. Sizer, Dean E. P. Bollier, Dean Francis M. Boddy, Dean Harry G. Yamaguchi, Dean Robert H. Baker, Dean Martin Chusid, Dean Roy S. Anderson, Dean Norman H. Cromwell	66
REPORTS OF COMMITTEES Committee on Testing Dr. John A. Winterbottom	74
Membership Committee Dean Joseph L. McCarthy	80

Committee on International Education <i>Dean Wade Ellis</i>	81
Committee on Computers in Graduate Education <i>Dean Harrison Shull</i>	85
Committee on Policies in Graduate Education <i>Dean George K. Fraenkel</i>	86
ASSOCIATION BUSINESS	
Report of the Editor of the <i>Journal of Proceedings</i>	88
Financial Report of the Treasurer	89
Report of the Committee on Nominations	91
Committees for 1970-71	92
Actions and Announcements	93
CONSTITUTION OF THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS	
	95
OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS: 1949-1971	
	97
MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, DEANS, AND ADDRESSES	99
INDEX	107

ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

OFFICERS AND EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

1969-70

President—Bryce Crawford, Jr.
Vice-President—W. Donald Cooke
Secretary-Treasurer—Michael J. Brennan
Member-at-Large and Editor of
the *Proceedings*—W. Gordon Whaley
Member-at-Large—William M. Protheroe
Past-President—Frederic Bohnenblust

1970-71

President—W. Donald Cooke
Vice-President—Robert H. Baker
Secretary-Treasurer—Michael J. Brennan
Member-at-Large—F. N. Andrews
Member-at-Large—Robert T. Lagemann
Past President—Bryce Crawford, Jr.
Editor of *Proceedings*—W. P. Albrecht

*THE TWENTY-SECOND
ANNUAL CONFERENCE
of the
ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE
SCHOOLS*

THE Twenty-second Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities took place in Montreal 22-23 October 1970. Sessions were held at the Hotel Bonaventure and in the Stephen Leacock Building of McGill University, with Dean Bryce Crawford, Jr., presiding.

DELEGATES ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

ALBRECHT, WILLIAM P., Dean, University of Kansas
ALPERT, DANIEL, Dean, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
ANDERSON, ROY S., Dean, Clark University
BAKER, ROBERT H., Dean, Northwestern University
BARTOO, JAMES B., Dean, Pennsylvania State University
BAUMER, ELMER F., Associate Dean, Ohio State University
BERMAN, DAVID, Associate Dean, University of Wisconsin, Madison
BODDY, FRANCIS M., Associate Dean, University of Minnesota
BOLLIER, E. P., Associate Dean, Tulane University
BRENNAN, MICHAEL J., Dean, Brown University
CHUSID, MARTIN, Associate Dean, New York University
COOKE, W. DONALD, Dean, Cornell University
CRAWFORD, BRYCE, JR., Dean, University of Minnesota
CROMWELL, NORMAN H., Dean, University of Nebraska
CROWE, C. LAWSON, Dean, University of Colorado
DANIELS, RALPH R., Associate Dean, University of Illinois, Medical Center
ELLIS, WADE, Associate Dean, University of Michigan
ELLISON, FRED P., Associate Dean, University of Texas, Austin
FRAENKEL, GEORGE K., Dean, Columbia University
FREY, K. F., Acting Vice-President for Research and Dean, Iowa State University

HAY, GEORGE E., Associate Dean, University of Michigan
 HOWELL, BENJAMIN F., JR., Assistant Dean, Pennsylvania State University
 HUBBARD, PAUL, Associate Dean, University of North Carolina
 HURLEY, FRANK H., Dean, Case Western Reserve University
 JONES, LYLE V., Dean, University of North Carolina
 KLOETZEL, MILTON C., Vice President, University of Southern California
 KRILL, KARL E., Associate Dean, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
 LAGEMANN, ROBERT T., Dean, Vanderbilt University
 LORAM, IAN C., Associate Dean, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 MASON, CHARLES M., Assistant Dean, University of Iowa
 MAU, JAMES, Assistant Dean, Yale University
 MAY, WILLIAM W., Associate Dean, University of Southern California
 MAYO, CHARLES G., Dean, University of Southern California
 MAZO, ROBERT M., Associate Dean, University of Oregon
 MCCARTHY, JOSEPH L., Dean, University of Washington
 MCKINNEY, JOHN C., Dean, Duke University
 MILLER, CAROL E., JR., Assistant Dean, University of Wisconsin, Madison
 MINKEL, C. W., Associate Dean, Michigan State University
 MORROW, RALPH E., Dean, Washington University
 MOSES, H. C., Associate Dean, Princeton University
 MURDOCK, JOHN C., Dean, University of Missouri, Columbia
 MURPHY, J. J., Associate Dean, Catholic University of America
 NICHOLLS, R.V.V., Acting Dean, McGill University
 O'CONNOR, JAMES P., Vice Provost and Dean, Catholic University of America
 O'KANE, D. J., Acting Dean, University of Pennsylvania
 PELCZAR, MICHAEL J., JR., Dean, University of Maryland
 PHELPS, REGINALD H., Associate Dean, Harvard University
 PROTHEROE, W. M., Dean, Ohio State University
 ROADEN, ARLISS L., Vice Provost for Graduate Affairs and Dean, Ohio State University
 ROCEK, JAN, Acting Dean, University of Illinois, Chicago Circle
 ROGERS, LORENE L., Associate Dean, University of Texas, Austin
 SHULL, HARRISON, Dean, Indiana University
 SIZER, IRWIN W., Dean, Massachusetts Institute of Technology
 SNYDER, HAROLD R., Associate Dean, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
 SPRAGG, S. D. SHIRLEY, Dean, University of Rochester
 SPRIESTERSBACH, D. C., Vice President for Educational Development and Research and Dean, University of Iowa
 STEVENS, WILLIAM F., Associate Dean, Northwestern University

STONE, GEORGE WINCHESTER, JR., Dean, New York University
THUNE, LELANE E., Associate Dean, Vanderbilt University
VEIS, ARTHUR, Assistant Dean, Northwestern University
WHALEY, W. GORDON, Dean, University of Texas
WEST, VINCENT I., Associate Dean, University of Illinois, Urbana-
Champaign
WHITEHEAD, W. DEXTER, Dean, University of Illinois, Urbana-
Champaign
YAMAGUCHI, HARRY G., Associate Dean, Indiana University

GUESTS ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

ARNSTEIN, GEORGE, Institution Relations Officer, National Science
Foundation
COOK, C. W., Chairman, General Foods Corporation
CORNELL, C. D., Director of Agency Liaison, University of Iowa
HUDGINS, GARVIN, Director of Research, National Association of
State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
HUMPHREYS, LLOYD G., Assistant Director for Education, National
Science Foundation
WILSON, O. MEREDITH, Director, Center for Advanced Study in the
Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University

ASSOCIATES ATTENDING THE CONFERENCE

KIDD, CHARLES V., Council for Federal Relations, Association of
American Universities
PAGE, J. BOYD, President, Council of Graduate Schools
WINTERBOTTOM, JOHN A., Educational Testing Service

AN EDITORIAL

A Turning Point

by W. DONALD COOKE

THERE are probably few knowledgeable persons who would dispute the observation that graduate education in the United States is now facing a turning point in its history. How sharp the turn will be, and even whether it will result in an enhancement or a decline in the strength of the enterprise is unknown.

After a decade of expanding enrollments and increasing budgets we are now facing an uncertain future. Graduate student support is declining at a rapid rate, and funding of academic science is at best leveling off.

The frenzied growth of the sixties was characterized by expansion in all directions. Departments competed for prestigious professors and money was available for the salary and fringe benefits necessary to attract them. Fresh doctorates in all fields were sought after. New graduate departments burst into existence, and such expansion was encouraged by government agencies and foundations. With the seventies came the cold, hard light of an uncertain dawn.

It does not require a mathematician to know that exponential growth can not continue indefinitely. It is just not possible to continue trends in Ph.D. production until there are more Ph.D.'s than persons in the age group. We were blinded by affluence and competition. The few voices that sounded warnings went unheard in the scramble for expansion.

When reality was eventually faced it was not by the universities but probably by someone at a desk in the Office of the Bureau of Management and Budget. The universities did not participate in the decision for the pure and simple reason that no one is authorized to speak for graduate education. The babble of voices within educational organizations, such as our own, rarely if ever merges into a consensus. The voice of the Association of Graduate Schools is muted, and individual institutions speak out in such contradictory terms that no one listens. Someone has to make decisions, and we are not involved because we value our autonomy more than an input in our future.

REPORT BY THE PRESIDENT:

The Reasons Why

by BRYCE CRAWFORD, JR.

Graduate education is being pressed to change: there are needs which it is not meeting, services which society needs, and for which it looks to graduate education, but which we are not providing. We have a panel tomorrow called "Time for a Change," and we have other matters before us, which indicate that a re-examination of graduate education, and some changes, are in order.

But some things need not changing but guarding, good things at the root of quality, and I would like to mention two very prosaic day-by-day nitty gritty items. One has to do with selective admission, even though we are under attack for being elitist. There are tendencies pressing towards open admission, not only at the undergraduate level but at the graduate level. We hear the cry, and it evokes national sympathy. We should, we are told, admit any student who has the ambition and desire to go to graduate school and let him have his chance. If he can't make it, then he will at least have had that experience and learned for himself that graduate study is not for him.

Of course, in fact, all of us practice selective admission. One reason we have to is the simple one of resources. We have knocking at our gates more students than we can handle, if they were all to come—certainly more in these days than we can find jobs for if they should succeed in obtaining our Ph.D. degrees. And this is one "reason why."

But I think we should keep in mind the deeper reasons why selective admission is philosophically desirable, even if we had unlimited resources. I think we are aware of this, certainly in institutions such as those represented here. My thoughts are hardly original, but I believe it is worth recalling them, keeping them not in the back of our minds but in the forefront.

The first of these underlying "reasons why" is to avoid the effective dilution of graduate-level instruction. Any teacher who is worth his salt in a lecture room, seminar room, or discussion session, will keep his eye on the overall class, and pitch the level of his instruction so that he will not be losing too many members of the class. Therefore if you have a class in which there is a sizable fraction of students who are low in natural aptitude or who have inadequate preparation for graduate-level discussion, that class will be held at a lower level; the dilution effect means not only that the weaker students so admitted are shortchanged with regard to true graduate stimulation but that the

abler students will also be shortchanged in the process. We know this. I think we should state it and get the message across so that our public understands this.

The second "reason why" on the philosophical level is that we do no student a kindness or favor if we admit him to graduate-level pursuits unless he does have the ability for graduate study. Graduate study is demanding, frustrating as we all know, and it can be a very traumatic experience for a student—certainly for one who fails out of graduate programs, but also for one who can barely keep up, who must work very, very hard in order to just barely pass.

Moreover we commit the ultimate unkindness to a marginal student if, in a misguided fit of compassion, we award him a marginal degree. I am afraid we have to admit that sometimes we give a degree not because a student has earned it but because he has been with us so long and is such a nice fellow that we give him his degree despite shortcomings. And I am sure that we thereby do a disservice to such a marginally qualified individual. For we condemn him for the rest of his life to trying to live up to the label which we have attached to him. Such an individual, like Mephistopheles in the play, may well say "this earth is hell nor am I out of it." For each of us, I think, should have a career occupation where he is challenged, wherein he needs to work hard to satisfy his own inner self, but which is not so difficult for him but that on occasion he will exceed the expectations of society with regard to his particular role, and even have that glorious satisfaction of saying to himself, "You know, I did that pretty well."

So I would assert that these two "reasons why" should underlie and do underlie selective admissions. And, although this is very prosaic and pragmatic, I think it is important that we keep our understanding of the basic rules for the process.

The other topic that I wish to comment on in these brief remarks—the other topic I think we should maintain an awareness of—is the importance of publication. These days we hear voices crying against "publish or perish" as a terrible, rigid policy, tending to reduce faculty members to rats in an academic rat race. And of course there is some truth in this.

We hear the voices saying that there is too much emphasis on research and not enough on teaching, that we should look to our faculty colleagues for effective teaching, that we should not lay so much stress on research. I think it is important for us to keep in mind why the emphasis on research—not overemphasis but emphasis—is justified. And this begins with the recognition that if a person is to be a good teacher, he needs to maintain his own intellectual activity. He needs to be in contact with the developing subject which he is teach-

ing. He needs to be aware of the advancing frontier, the cutting edge if you prefer, of knowledge with regard to his discipline, so that his knowledge does not stop with his textbook. If you have a man who is carrying out research studies, his own scholarly work, he is commuting to the frontier, and this gives a depth and richness to his teaching and enlivens it.

Some may say that certainly our faculty should be in touch with what is going on, that they should read the literature, but why the emphasis on publication? In discussions on this, I have developed in my own mind an awareness that the importance of publication is not to advertise the individual or even get the names of his graduate students before the world or to bring distinction on his head or his university. All these things are good. But the basic importance of publication is that it is the device by which scholarship keeps itself pure and healthy. It is very easy for me to read the literature and form what I believe is an adequate understanding. I may even have a bright idea, and as I contemplate it by myself, it glows. Clearly I see that I have penetrated a little closer to the heart of this particular topic. It is very easy for me to explain this to a class, even a graduate-level class, and convince the students that I have a new insight which I am giving them. But I might be wrong; and if I write that new insight down, if I reduce it to a paper *and then publish it*, I expose it to the criticism of my peers.

First of all I expose it to the criticism of those savage people, the editors and the journal reviewers. There are hidden in my desk drawer three or four manuscripts which the reviewers were kind enough to spot flaws in, and which, therefore, I could discreetly bury and no longer expose even to my classes. I regret to say that there is one publication in which the reviewers missed some flaws; and it was only some years later that one of my colleagues got himself a publication by exposing the sloppy mathematics and faulty mental intuition in this paper of mine. You will excuse me if I do not quote the citation.

So I would emphasize the fact that the process of publication is—and I think it is not too high-flown a simile—a sacrament of scholarship by which we do keep our scholarship bright and pure and correct. And this I would say is the underlying “reason why” we do intuitively emphasize the importance of publication.

I think in these days as we seek to be responsive to the real needs for the development of other degrees, we must not cheapen nor discard the Ph.D. It has served society well, and it continues to do so. And it will continue to do so as long as we maintain it as a degree with the significance and quality it traditionally has had. So I have spoken on these two “reasons why” we need to hold firmly to some aspects of graduate education which may sometimes appear too rigid.

[7]

REPORT ON FEDERAL RELATIONS

[Talks were presented, on 22 October, by Dr. Lloyd G. Humphreys, National Science Foundation, and, on 23 October, by Dr. Charles Kidd, AAU Council for Federal Relations. The general discussions following these talks are summarized below.—Ed.]

DR. LLOYD G. HUMPHREYS

I AM the Assistant Director for Education in the Foundation. I have been there since the middle of June. I am just beginning to learn about the program in Education alone, but I do know something about the operation of the rest of the Foundation. I will be willing to try to answer other questions that you may have as well as to try to answer questions about the Educational Program.

It was not essential that I appear on this program to inform you about probable changes in support of graduate students by the National Science Foundation, since Dr. Kidd could have done that. But I was very happy to receive an invitation. I did want to be here in order to defend the proposed changes if defense were needed.

The changes to be described have been approved by the National Science Board but require approval by the Office of Management and Budget. I hoped that I would have something more definite for you by this time, but unfortunately I don't. This is an exceedingly undesirable state of affairs and one that is beyond our control. For example, we do not at the moment have an appropriation for fiscal 1971.

Our appropriation was vetoed by the President. The veto was upheld by the Congress. We were rather small potatoes in the overall bill and were caught up between the Executive and the Congress on other grounds than the size of our own budget.

The best guess that I can make is that we won't have a final appropriation for the current fiscal year before Christmas. This creates difficulties for you of which I am aware. It also, I might mention, creates difficulties for us.

First, with respect to the Fellowship Program. We have proposed a number of changes in the administration of the Graduate Fellowship Program. First a Fellow will be appointed for a maximum of three years. The Fellowship will start the academic year following the award, but the three years of tenure can be taken any time in the five following the award. This will allow a Fellow to leave school and work if he chooses, to take a research assistantship for a year or two,

or to obtain a teaching assistantship or a beginning instructorship. There will be no formal re-screening after the initial screening and award. The University will simply certify that the student is or is not in good standing. I hope that these changes will simplify the administrative burden on the offices of Graduate Deans.

There will also be changes in stipends and cost of education allowance. The stipend for Fellows will be set at \$3,600 for twelve months to make it a truly distinctive award. The cost of education allowance will be set at \$3,000. This is perhaps one item of good news that I have for you this morning. Universities will be allowed to supplement as before, but the need for this should be substantially reduced.

Dependency allowances will be abolished, however. With the university retaining the option of supplementing the stipend, a particularly able student with multiple dependents can be supported by the university. Note that this places the determination of need at the local level. And I assume that your hearts will not bleed automatically just because the student had made the mistake of early marriage and early procreation. The Fellowship Program is not likely to grow appreciably and may actually be cut back somewhat. You are all familiar with the apparent reaching or over-reaching of the demand for new Ph.D.'s. We have been asked by the Office of Management and Budget how many fellowships are required as a recognition of excellence, which is how they view the function of the Fellowship Program. Any help you can give me on this score will be appreciated.

Incidentally I do not personally quarrel with this interpretation although I do add attraction of excellence to the recognition of excellence. My own review of the manpower data—and I have been going at this strenuously since the middle of June—and available projections convince me that present placement difficulties are not temporary, if we continue to turn out Ph.D.'s at recent rates. Projections are of course risky, but we have to make projections in order to plan. That is, if we continue to turn out Ph.D.'s at recent rates, by 1980 there will be a very substantial oversupply, and Ph.D.'s will be placed in jobs that are now not filled by Ph.D.'s, and jobs that, in the opinion of many, do not require Ph.D.'s.

I have seen three separate independent projections of supply and demand, and the most conservative indicates a substantial oversupply unless something is done. Either we cut back on the number of Ph.D.'s, or we channel applicants for graduate schools into other types of degree programs than the Ph.D.—other types of degree programs that may be more functional for the individual and for society.

We have argued strenuously against a loan program as a primary support for graduate training, for this, I think, is not tolerable. You cannot add four years of graduate loans on top of four years of under-

graduate loans. Our data indicate that the lifetime income advantage of the Ph.D. over the B.A. is not sufficient to justify a loan program either. But we don't object to the primary use of research and teaching assistants for graduate student support. I am quite willing to let graduate students earn their support, with the exception of the Fellowship Program and the functions that it provides.

Now with respect to traineeships. Generalized traineeships of the sort we have sponsored in the Foundation for the last several years are dead, although present commitments for support of advanced graduate students will be met. There will be no new starts in the current fiscal year or in the foreseeable future.

I might remind you in this connection that the President's budget for fiscal 1971 reduced new starts in traineeships to zero. The Congress added, I think, nine and a half million dollars for traineeships. Even if this nine and a half million dollars comes back into our appropriation, when it is passed and signed, it is virtually certain that we won't be allowed to spend that money for the older type of traineeships.

I am a statistician. I try to think in terms of probability. I am not saying that we won't be allowed to spend this money, but, as I view the situation, the probability against our being allowed to spend it is ninety-nine point nine, at least.

In place of generalized traineeships, there is a good chance that there will be categorical traineeship support for selected programs that meet national needs. To start a program of this sort in the current academic year would be very difficult, but we are determined to go ahead—if we obtain the green light to do so. Obviously a great deal of effort will be required in the universities and in particular in the offices of the graduate deans.

Thus I am describing plans that are not yet final in the expectation that full approval will be obtained, although I am not attaching a ninety-nine point nine percent probability to that expectation. And I am doing this in the hope that you can do some preliminary thinking and planning along the lines of intended support.

Programs that meet national needs can be described as belonging to one or more of several types. Disciplines in which manpower is still in short supply constitute one type. Computer science is an obvious category here. I don't know whether oceanography is a discipline or whether ecology is a discipline, but there will probably be categorical traineeship support, if we obtain approval for the general program, in these areas as well.

A second type of program that meets national needs is applied interdisciplinary research training leading to a Ph.D. The programs that we have in mind have, as a primary emphasis, applied research on prob-

lems of our society. The extent of interdisciplinary program involvement is secondary. The emphasis on applied problems is primary. Programs may involve the physical sciences, the biological sciences, or the social sciences, or any set or combination involving the three. Programs may be in engineering schools, agricultural schools, liberal arts college departments, or in new organizational settings.

A third type of categorical traineeship is as follows: graduate programs that are not primarily research oriented or that might be described as professionally oriented. An orientation towards the problems of the practitioner, whether it be the teaching of science, the master's level technologist, or the professionally oriented scientist adviser or manager, will be required in this third category.

The degree can be sub-doctoral, a Doctor of Arts or other new doctoral degree, or a drastically revised Ph.D. The Foundation does not and should not specify the degree, but what we have in mind for categorical support in this area does not fit with the definition of the Ph.D. that most of you prefer.

Incidentally I am not sure just how strong your preferences are. I have had some experience in the last ten years in establishing a new doctoral degree at the University of Illinois—a Doctor of Psychology in Clinical Psychology or a Practitioner of Clinical Psychology. I think most of your departments—it is safe to say—are turning out professional clinical psychologists, although the rest of you, except at Illinois, are still giving Ph.D.'s for this kind of training. It is my frank opinion that present clinical training does not fit the definition that your group has derived for the Ph.D. degree.

Now there are difficulties, of course, in establishing new degrees. There is a lot of controversy about the Doctor of Arts degree, a lot of concern about its being a second-class degree. I have been talking along these lines for years among psychologists, so I am familiar, I think, with practically all of the arguments. Obviously it seems to me that the all-but-dissertation certificate is the real second-class degree. It also in my opinion is a "cop out" on the part of the graduate school. It is not functional, in my opinion, for the purpose for which it was intended.

The facts are that any new degree is going to be considered a second-class degree by people who hold a Ph.D. This is obvious. We can't get around that, but the object is to set up new degrees that will have prestige of their own among their own clientele. The Doctor of Psychology is a very, very popular degree among students graduating from departments of psychology and applying for graduate work. In a recent year the Department of Psychology at the University of Illinois had four hundred completed applications for the professional degree in Clinical Psychology, and the department was able to accept some-

thing like thirty out of four hundred. There were at the same time one hundred applications for the Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology degree there.

I think it is safe to say that even the lack of prestige of the Ed.D. degree is not felt strongly outside the academic circles where the Ph.D. is predominant. The city school superintendent who comes back to his city with a new Ed.D. from the state university feels no lack of prestige at all when he appears at the weekly meeting of the Rotary Club and people start calling him doctor when a few years before he was called mister.

We have to forget about, I think, the matter of differential prestige and try to make new degrees, if we go in that direction, just as important, just as useful, just as strenuous for the purposes for which they are designed as is the Ph.D.

The stipends for these proposed traineeships will be set at \$3,000 to be competitive with half-time assistantships but designed to be less prestigious than the fellowship. The cost of education allowance will be the same as for fellows. Three years of support will be provided as for fellows at a decreasing scale for the second and third year. Supplementation will be allowed, and again there will be no dependency allowances. I assume that this means there will be a change in a very interesting statistic that has been true in recent years: that is, trainees have had twice as many allowable dependents as fellows. Your interpretation of this interesting bit of information is, I am sure, better than mine.

Now in addition to the changes in the support of trainees and fellows, I would like to mention, just at the end, our special projects. In addition to the student support program, we have a very limited amount of funds to support special projects at the graduate level. I am doing my best to protect such funds against possible budget cuts because educational innovation is needed and for the most part innovations cannot be tested in a psychological or educational laboratory. They must be tried out and evaluated *in situ*.

An interesting little example, at the Colorado State University, brings graduate education engineering courses to industrial engineers at the plant in which they work by means of TV tapes and feedback loop involving students and the instructor.

In accordance with our interest in categorical traineeships, we would be interested in innovative curricula development that also has promise for meeting urgent national needs.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

In answer to Dean Joseph L. McCarthy's question, Dr. Humphreys replied that the new traineeship concept is equally applicable to master's and

doctoral programs, and to the Doctor of Engineering and the Doctor of Arts as well as to the Ph.D. Dean Arliss L. Roaden asked about the total dollar support. The total fellowship funds, Dr. Humphreys replied, will be about the same as in 1970, with increased stipends and institutional allowances reducing the number of fellowships somewhat, despite the abolishing of dependency allowances. About \$10,000,000 will be available for new starts. For new starts in the categorical traineeships it has been proposed to spend about \$4,500,000, which will provide about 600 to 700 traineeships. In reply to a question from Dean Frank H. Hurley, Dr. Humphreys pointed out that the new categorical traineeships will be scaled down as former traineeships have been, with the NSF's commitment reduced to two-thirds the second year and one-third the third year.

Dean Robert H. Baker asked whether the governmental agencies wish to hold Ph.D. production at the present level. Dr. Humphreys answered that the NSF is concerned with the overproduction of Ph.D.'s that would result if the present rate of increase continued. He hoped that some of the demand for graduate training could be directed into other types of programs for which there is a developing social need. There is a danger, Dean Baker replied, that the curtailment of support could make it difficult to maintain even the present rate of production and would lead, therefore, to an under-supply of doctorates. Dr. Humphreys reported an awareness of this danger. He also reported, in answer to Dean S. D. S. Spragg, Dean Reginald H. Phelps, Vice President Milton C. Kloetzel, and Dean Daniel Alpert, respectively, that the door has been shut on the old type of generalized traineeships; that the maximum supplementation will remain the same; that, beyond fiscal 1971, the prospects for the Institutional Grant Programs are uncertain, and that something like \$1,000,000 or \$2,000,000 a year will be available for the special project program.

In reply to a question from Dean Irwin W. Sizer, Dr. Humphreys explained that, in order to apply for the categorical traineeships, a university will be asked to make a proposal in the kind of area previously described. Asked by Dean George K. Fraenkel regarding the Foundation's concern for geographical distribution, Dr. Humphreys explained that there are no geographical restrictions on a fellow's choice of an institution and that, with the new criteria for the categorical traineeships, geographical consideration will be clearly secondary to the content of the program itself.

Dean G. Winchester Stone asked how the NSF decided on the country's social needs. Dr. Humphreys replied that the Foundation—as well as the Office of Management and Budget, the Administration, and the Congress—relies on figures with respect to supply and demand. The National Science Board, comprising national figures in science and technology appointed by the President, has approved the proposals described by Dr. Humphreys. Furthermore, academic people influence such decisions through an advisory committee on the educational activities of the NSF, through the NSF Office of Economics and Manpower Studies, through questionnaires sent to faculty members, and through organizations such as the AGS.

Dean C. Lawson Crowe asked whether the restriction of geographical representation, inherent in the new fellowship and categorical traineeship programs, does not expose the Foundation to some political pressures. Yes, Dr. Humphreys replied, it does; in fact, within the Foundation there have been informal discussions of ways to achieve somewhat more scattering of the fellowships.

DR. CHARLES V. KIDD

Relations between the universities and the government remind me of a cartoon that is etched on my mind forever. It showed a fellow hanging from a cliff straight down two thousand feet. He was hanging with a pick just caught on a little crevice, and another mountain climber had him by the ankles dangling over the abyss. And the fellow on top said: "You turn loose of my foot or I'm going to hit you with this pick." This indicates about as well as anything the nature of the current relationship.

We are developing what seems to me to be a productive interaction between the AGS and the AAU. As you know, your president attends the meetings of the Council on Federal Relations of the AAU, and of the AAU itself. He is free to bring up any matters of importance to the deans.

I think that I can be most helpful to you by summarizing the major topics of discussion at the Council on Federal Relations meeting that was held last week. We can then have a general discussion.

At that meeting, there was a review of recent developments in general legislation for higher education, which I shall recapitulate. You will recall that last spring the President stated a set of unexceptionable goals accompanied by objectionable means of arriving at those laudable ends. The proposals of the President were drawn up with very little participation of the Office of Education, and none with the universities or their representatives. This accounts for the development of propositions that were simply not acceptable either to the universities or the Congressional committees. However, there have been some shifts in the attitude of the administration represented by Secretary Richardson and the Office of Education staff. Incidentally, communication between the administration and representatives of higher education has been excellent. A group of college and university presidents has been meeting regularly with Richardson, and staff groups have been conferring on all aspects of legislative proposals.

Let me indicate what these unacceptable proposals were, and how the attitude of the administration has changed. For example, there was proposed a National Foundation for Higher Education, which had a useful innovative function. It was set up on the model of the National Science Foundation. It would have provided money for adventuresome undertakings in higher education, but this was accompanied by a proposal to fold such things as language and area study programs into a foundation which at the moment has a zero budget. The prospects therefore were simply for the extinction of a number of categorical programs that are thought of by the universities as programs which simultaneously serve academic and important national functions. But

at the moment there is agreement among those representatives of higher education who are meeting with Richardson and his staff that it would be a good idea to have a foundation for higher education and that it should not include any operating functions. This is a salutary shift on the part of the administration.

To return to the specifics, the President proposed in the spring of 1970 that the existing library assistance programs and the general and special assistance to libraries would be taken off the statutory books. The administration now agrees that that program—Title 2—should remain in the law. The administration also proposed in the spring of 1970 to do away with the program for developing institutions. They have now agreed that this program should also stay in the legislation. The proposal last spring deleted from the existing legislation authority for all grants and direct loans for construction of academic facilities. The administration has agreed that this grant and direct loan authority should not be dropped from the law.

Let me now turn to the student aid portions of the legislation. Here the outlook for constructive change in the President's spring 1970 proposals does not seem bright at the moment. In all probability, the legislation will propose a three-part aid package for students. The basic aid will be a grant—an Economic Opportunity Grant—and a work-study payment available to students from families with very low incomes. The next part of the package will be a subsidized loan available to students from families with somewhat higher incomes. All students from families with incomes above the subsidized loan cut-off level will rely on unsubsidized loans. The effort to set up a secondary market for this loan paper will probably be continued.

One of the prime defects of the administration's proposal is that the power to set the family income levels that determine eligibility for grants and for subsidized loans is given to the Secretary of HEW with no statutory guides. Under the law, he can set the family income levels for grants and subsidized loans at a high or at a low level. We would like to see meaningful policy guides written into the law. It is, in fact, reasonable to assume that administration spokesmen mean what they say, and that the maximum family adjusted income level for students eligible for grants will be about \$6,000 per year. The maximum level for subsidized loans will probably be about \$10,000 per year.

The administration apparently will ask for appropriations adequate to finance a grant and subsidized loan program with approximately these income cut-off levels.

As you may remember, one of our principal objections to the President's proposal of last spring was that his plan would in fact force students from low income families to go to institutions with low charges. Whether the administration will follow our recommendation

that a new subsidized loan program be established to permit low income students to attend colleges and universities with higher than minimum charges remains to be seen.¹

When all of the details are swept away, our argument is a simple one—not enough money is being spent by the Federal government on aid to students who want to go to college. All of the rhetoric about equal access, and concentrating aid on lower income groups, is meaningless unless enough money is appropriated. (The President's budget for fiscal year 1972, released in February 1971, did propose increases in funds for EOG payments and work study, but the proposed increases are not adequate to finance the proposed equal access policy.)

Congress will probably not buy the administration's proposals for student aid if the President's package is essentially the one which went to Congress in the spring of 1970. I would not be surprised if the existing legislation, which expires in the spring of 1971, is simply renewed. This would not be a bad outcome if the appropriations were adequate.

It is rather early to attempt to forecast what will happen either to substantive legislation or to appropriations in the next session.

Take first the possibility of new legislation. I think that there is a good chance that a new National Foundation for Higher Education will be established, partly because we have reached an agreement with the administration on what such a foundation should and should not do. But the proposal may be bogged down, and nothing may happen.

So far as appropriations are concerned, the picture—so far as anyone outside the Office of Management and Budget can guess—is mixed. The President will probably propose increases for grants to very low income students. On the other hand, the possibility of any money for academic facility grants is just about zero. And appropriations for fellowships and traineeships will probably be cut. The same is true of funds for institutional support through NSF and NIH. It looks like another tough year so far as graduate student support and institutional support are concerned.

The outlook for appropriations for academic science is not clear. The Director of the National Science Foundation, William McElroy, is an extraordinarily effective advocate, so NSF appropriations may rise. Also, the presence of George Shultz and Edward David may be felt. If the unemployment remains high, general fiscal pressures for spending may boost the academic science budget request. However, these are guesses, and the real declines in Federal support may continue.

There are some new organizations in Washington, as usual. There is the new National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency, as you probably

¹ This recommendation was in fact later adopted by the administration.

know. There is also a new Environmental Protection Agency. These new agencies will not provide additional research grants and contracts to universities for quite a while because activities will be simply transferred into these new entities with no additional budget at the moment. However, the long-run prospects for additional funds is fairly bright in both these areas. In many universities the development of any significant activity relating to either the environment or to the oceans is going to wait until more Federal money becomes available.

Student unrest arouses many antagonisms in Congress as well as in State legislatures. Mrs. Green is very disturbed over the fact that only four hundred students have had their Federal aid withdrawn as a result of the riots. This can be very serious because, if she becomes convinced that universities are evading the law, the consequences for universities will be serious. I am collecting data on why so few students have had aid withdrawn, and the reasons are obvious when the returns are studied. Many law-breaking students have been expelled, so their Federal aid stops and is not withheld. Most students who have broken laws have not received any Federal assistance. These facts will be transmitted to Mrs. Green.

Now as for contract compliance and discrimination and related activities in the Department of HEW, the big push at the moment is not so much on the employment of Blacks as it is the employment of women and discrimination against women in the academic community, which, Lord knows, has existed. More will be heard from HEW on this subject over the months ahead. At the moment, my advice is that deans look very directly and candidly at recruitment, pay, and promotion policies, and that they undertake in good faith to ensure that unfair discrimination does not exist.

Now there is a significant "McIntyre Amendment" to the military procurement bill. It provides for a one hundred million dollar increase in the National Science Foundation's budget, and a policy declaration that what is dropped by the military should be picked up by the National Science Foundation. Well, the one hundred million dropped out but the policy declaration stayed.

All in all, the severe attack that basic research and academic research was under about a year ago has somewhat abated. However, the proof of this pudding will be in the outcome of the appropriations process.

Now the anti-bombing legislation has generated a lot of attention. I am no lawyer, but lawyers tell me that it really does not add anything. The authority already existed. The FBI have not been hesitant about entering campuses for bombings. The proposed legislation is more a part of the fall 1970 Congressional campaign than a serious part of a legislative program.

As you know there may well be a new quasi-governmental institute to administer the technical assistance aspects of foreign aid. If established, this institute will be important to universities because it will provide a clear point for university cooperation in the technical assistance business.

Alex Heard reported to the AAU presidents on his stay in the White House and the current political position of universities. The outcome of that discussion was simply that this is not a good season for universities, and that they should not take a strong public position on issues. There was some dissent. Tom Eliot, for example, said that a good strong voice is needed at this time. However, the feeling was that presidents or deans of universities are not the best public spokesmen at this time. There was a feeling that good strong trustees should be persuaded to talk in defense of the university.

With respect to the ROTC, an important document went out on September the fifteenth to universities from DOD. This document opens up the possibility of new flexibility in negotiations. DOD does not want to be pushed into a written position, but they are prepared to negotiate locally a string of things, such as curriculum development, course substitution and disenrollment procedures. The question of rank is not negotiable, but title is. The chief military man should be called a program director and not a professor if the institute wants that. There will be an increased effort to get institutional reimbursement at the level of five hundred dollars per graduate, which is at least a start towards meeting the cost problems that have plagued the institutions.

In summary, the word we have is to negotiate locally and pay heed to that September fifteenth document.

I would like to conclude by making a proposition that will be of interest to you, even though you may not agree with it.

This proposition is that the AGS formally adopt a position on three central policy issues relating to Federal matters, so that this position can be transmitted to the administration. The support of the AGS will be significant. I should preface these three points by noting that the goal at this time is not to state one's heart's desire or an ideal program but to urge support levels substantially higher than the administration would be inclined to propose, but not so elevated as to have the propositions dismissed as the usual kind of request from academia. The first point is that the Domestic Council and the new Office of Management and Budget, which replaced the Bureau of Budget, establish a greater degree of continuity, stability, and predictability in budgets for academic science and in support for students.

The second point is to settle for the next three years for about an eight per cent a year increase in Federal academic science expenditures, overall, and for restoration of the 1970 level for support of graduate

students, with cost of living increases thereafter. And incidentally to try to sustain stability within each agency as well as totally. Then, within that overall eight per cent increase, to increase the budget of the National Science Foundation for academic science (which is now roughly three hundred million dollars) at twenty per cent per year.

The proposal to sustain support of graduate students at the fiscal year 1970 level may seem inadequate to you, since it is well below the peak year of 1968. However, I would point out that current levels are below 1970 expenditures, and the prospect is for further sharp cuts. In my opinion, we would be fortunate if fellowships and traineeships could be restored to the 1970 level.

It would be most helpful if the AAU could have the judgment of this group when it meets next week. Now I could go on at length, but I won't. I will be glad to answer any questions or hear any comments that people have.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Answering a question from Dean Spragg, Dr. Kidd replied that the NDEA fellowship program will continue but that there probably will not be very many new starts for 1972.

With respect to the National Science Foundation, Dean McCarthy moved a resolution supporting three points made by Dr. Kidd: (1) a greater degree of predictability in budgets for academic science, (2) an eight per cent increase per year, for the next three years, in support of academic science, and, (3) within the overall eight per cent increase, a twenty per cent increase per year in the NSF budget for academic and graduate sciences, including fellowship and traineeship support. Dean Crawford suggested endorsing this resolution in principle and leaving it to the Executive Committee to sharpen the wording and devise the means of correlating with the actions of the presidents. With this understanding, the motion was passed after some further discussion.

REPORT ON COMMUNICATIONS WITH THE PUBLIC

[The Committee on Communication with the Public presented, as its report, talks by Dr. George Arnstein, National Science Foundation and Mr. D. C. Cornell, University of Iowa. The program and the speakers were introduced by the Chairman of the Committee, Dean D. C. Spriestersbach. The ensuing general discussion is summarized following Mr. Cornell's remarks.—Ed.]

DEAN D. C. SPRIESTERSBACH

THE Committee on Communications with the Public is a new committee, and I would like to take a moment to quote from the charge that President Crawford gave to the Committee: "Your charge grows out of the conviction of a number of us that we are not serving our institutions or higher education or indeed society as well as we might in terms of communicating with the public, not only in terms of its elected representatives in Washington but in terms of the man in the street. The AGS, as a collective organization, can and does occasionally raise its voice, and more recently it has a new channel for communications with government centers through the Council on Federal Relations of the AAU. I suspect in terms of communications with the broad public less can be done by AGS, collectively, than can be done through individual efforts of the institutions holding membership in AGS. Your charge is to bring back to the AGS institutions some stimulus toward such communications and hopefully some pragmatic advice, perhaps with citations of methods which have been found effective in such communications." Since the committee got organized late in the year, I propose that we take this hour of your time on the program to consider some nuts and bolts aspects of the problem of communication and that this morning's discussion constitute this year's committee report.

I would also like to add that the entire Committee is here and will use the stimulus of this discussion as the basis for a committee meeting on Friday afternoon after this meeting has been concluded. At that time I will propose an agenda to the Committee which will include identification of the major constituencies to be included in the communications net of our complex institutions, identification of some of the major issues to be presented to these constituents, proposals for specific techniques for communicating what to whom in light of the

discussions of the nature and needs of our constituents, and assignments to various members of the Committee to develop materials that we can pass along for whatever use you might like to make of them.

With that as an introduction, then, I would like to turn to the panel and ask each member to make preliminary remarks which we hope will be provocative enough to kick off responses from you that will be helpful to us all.

DR. GEORGE E. ARNSTEIN

To the best of my knowledge I have never faced so many graduate deans at one time before. I am tempted to behave like a doctoral candidate: to display my erudition, my rote learning, and my intellectual powers, even though I have been referred to as "non biodegradable." Instead, I plan to follow my instructions, which were: to offer pragmatic advice and to cite methods on how to communicate with the public, specifically the Congress, whence most blessings flow, and the man in the street, in part because biennially he enters the voting booth. In deference to my wife, and to keep her from joining women's lib, I also add the *woman* in the street.

What I plan to do next is to give in to my long-standing secret aspiration; that is, I'm going to give you a test—and I have arranged for a monitor at the proper moment to pass out the test papers to the class. That's Dave Cornell if he is willing. It is only one page long.

To provide some background and explanation: I contend that the academic community is not doing a good job of communicating with the public, largely because it has not really tried to do so, has not put its mind to it, and has not faced up to the fact that popular support is important, that popular support is directly related to financial support (private and public), and that support is based on understanding of what higher education is all about.

Part of the difficulty is the reward system: professors and researchers seek, above all, the approval of their peers. To get this approval they publish in learned journals, write with precision to the point of using jargon, deal with abstract ideas and theories, and hope to get elected to the presidency of the Association of Universal Polymaths. This behavior is analogous to the sheet-metal worker who wants to become a 33rd degree Mason or a Moose, Lion, Elk, or Odd Fellow.

It is my contention that most scholars have only an imperfect understanding of that other, broader audience which we can sum up as "men in the street" or "voters" or the "grassroots." This audience can be divided into many, many subgroups, and they can be reached through different media.

In selecting one particular segment of this larger public—the

younger people who may be said to be part of the youth culture—I merely want to illustrate how each subgroup, each special audience, requires understanding and how many obstacles there may be. The test, which I have acquired through the courtesy of Charles Perry, is meant to help you visualize the kind of world inhabited by one significant group which makes up the public.

And this is what I would like to pass out to you now. The test is self-scoring and self-administrative in the sense that I will put the answers on the board. When I had the test administered to me I didn't ask if there were any penalties for guessing. I just assumed that to leave any blanks would work against me.

Well, you get to do your own scoring and your own administering. I admire your silence and the co-operation. Let me hold off just a little longer before I give you the answers which I will post on the board. What I am of course trying to do is to demonstrate—one, that there are certain advantages to involvement, that one way of communicating with an audience is to get the audience a little more involved in what you are trying to convey. The other thing I am trying to illustrate in part is that this is merely one segment of a larger audience. We sometimes think of an audience as being a monolithic thing when in fact if we seek to reach and communicate with them we have to break down the audience into its various segments, which overlap. For example, if we talk about voting behavior, many people think religious groups; very often, I fear, those who are against a particular religious sect or religious organization are more highly motivated than those who are for it. Be that as it may, the audience in the last analysis consists of many different segments of which this is meant to illustrate one.

These are the young people who, by the way, do vote, except those who are so alienated from the system that they will have no part of it, whose views influence the Congress, and whose aspirations may differ from those of the scholarly community of senior scholars and administrators.

You know better than I do that some members of the faculty have good rapport with young people, and some do not; some professors even lose status among their colleagues if they are too popular—and that's another side of the quandary I mentioned earlier. To enlist public support, to communicate effectively with various audiences may be incompatible with the existing system of rewards in the scholarly community.

Please note that I have not used the phrase the "silent majority," mostly because I recall the original meaning of Homer, who used it to refer to the dead, the original silent majority.

Because 15 minutes have been allotted to me I must abstain from a discussion of *what* it is we should be communicating. I have even

neglected part of my instructions, which were to cite methods. What I have tried to do is to explore with you the obstacles which now prevent communication: mostly the lack of incentives, the failure to realize that we need popular support if the universities are to survive.

As for methods, obviously I see a need for simplicity without vulgarization, for directness, for concrete examples rather than abstractions, and for more attention to the needs of an audience which prefers TV to print, as shown by the massive shift in advertising budgets from the late *Saturday Evening Post* to the growing TV industry.

The test of the market place is cruel. Many members of the academic community communicate in a sheltered area where journals are subsidized and where the law of supply and demand has quite properly been suspended or even revoked. Outside the ivory tower, however, we must compete for the time and attention of an audience which is assaulted daily and hourly with four-color illustrations, rhythmic musical messages, and not very subtle sexual titillations. It is against this background noise that we compete for funds, for understanding of a rather esoteric pursuit of knowledge, and for the continuing machinery to provide educational opportunity for the children of beer-drinking, TV-watching, football-betting parents.

We may have to choose between the approval of our peers who read the *New York Times* and the support of the public which finds the *Times* gray and dull, which in the immortal words of James Thurber, tells us more about penguins than many of us want to know.

Just as the dean explained that Freshman English is important because he wants his students to learn a language in addition to their own, the time has come for us to cultivate an audience in addition to the one we meet at the faculty club.

I will not post or read to you the scores of the correct answers, for which I disclaim all responsibility. They are provided by the Reverend Dr. Perry.

The answers are:

Youth Culture Matching Test

(Please place appropriate letter in front of *best* matching answer)

- | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----|-------------------------------------|
| s | 1) speed Kills | a) | sitarist |
| k | 2) Dennis Hopper | b) | song from Hair |
| l | 3) Eldridge Cleaver | c) | composer-singer |
| m | 4) stoned | d) | arrested |
| g | 5) Jerry Rubin | e) | battle cry of war resisters |
| p | 6) Herbert Marcuse | f) | phony |
| j | 7) Steppenwolf | g) | creator of Alice's Restaurant |
| b | 8) Aquarius | h) | non drug user, also opposite of hip |

[23]

- | | |
|----------------------|--------------------------------------|
| c 9) Paul Simon | i) slogan of National Safety Council |
| x 10) The Who | j) novel by Hermann Hesse |
| n 11) Mark Rudd | k) hip motion picture actor-director |
| g 12) Arlo Guthrie | l) author of Soul on Ice |
| h 13) straight | m) high on grass, drugs, etc. |
| a 14) Ravi Shankar | n) S.D.S. leader |
| v 15) pig | o) co-founder of Black Panthers |
| f 16) plastic | p) Marxist social theorist |
| w 17) street people | q) yippie leader |
| t 18) The Mobe | r) well known guru |
| d 19) busted | s) warning against amphetamines |
| o 20) Huey Newton | t) anti-war protest organizers |
| | u) beaten up |
| Courtesy of: | v) derisive term for authority |
| Rev. Charles Perry | w) hippies |
| Box 336 | x) creators of Tommy—a rock opera |
| Bloomington, Indiana | |

The man who compiled this test, Dr. Perry, explained that this is not a way-out vocabulary. This is supposed to be within a reasonable normal youth culture vocabulary, which of course at times everyone in this room with one single exception.

MR. C. DAVID CORNELL

Recently, when I was in Washington, I was told an amusing yet sad story by the Executive Director of one of our educational associations. It was a hot, humid Wednesday morning in July. At 9:30 a young man from a midwestern university appeared in this man's office. His mission? "My President told me that I should go down to Washington and find out what's going on. Where do I start?"

The tragedy of this true happening is that there are too many such young men, and some older ones, who approach the question of the Washington scene with precisely this orientation. It is not their personal fault they don't know, but it certainly is an indictment of their institutions that they have paid little or no attention to Washington through the years. Among the State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, their traditional orientation has been to their state capitols. And while this orientation has continued, they have seen the proportion of their budget from Federal funding increase while the percentage of the total from state sources has decreased. Twenty-five percent of our University's budget is Federal money. Having been in private education, I can also fault the administrators in private institutions, because they too have become increasingly dependent on Federal funding without being aware of the significance of effective Federal liaison.

Whether in the public or private sector, all of us in higher education should pay some attention to our very important audiences in Washington. And I emphasize to this group, this is especially true in a period when graduate education especially faces a severe challenge from reduced funding and when the wrath of multiple publics is directed toward a nebulous goal of less research and more teaching.

When we talk about the Washington audience, I have in mind both the legislative and executive branches. In my position at The University of Iowa, I am concerned with both audiences. Now I would like to concentrate on the legislative portion of our program, which I am pleased to say received one of the four Certificates of Exceptional Achievement this last summer from the American College Public Relations Association. In the executive area, I will defer to George Arnstein. If there are specific questions any of you would like to raise about our efforts with Federal agencies, I'll be glad to answer them during the question and answer period.

In his famous treatise *The Rhetorica*, Aristotle notes, "Audiences are necessarily either critics or judges; and if the latter, they may be judges of things lying either in the past or in the future. And, a member of the Public Assembly may be taken as an instance of a judge of the future. . . ." If we are to subscribe to what this great rhetorician had to say 2,300 years ago, then all of us in higher education should pay some attention to one of our most important audiences—the men and women of Aristotle's Public Assembly who sit in Washington or in Ottawa. Although my examples are from the States, those of you from the Dominion can substitute your own "for instances."

I would challenge anyone to say he is not affected by Aristotle's Public Assembly. After all how many of you have not received Title I or VI monies, Work-Study Grants, EOGs, NDEA Loans, Guaranteed Student Loans? How many of you did not have an interest in last year's tax reform bill, in the riders to various bills which dealt with "student unrest," or with the generalities as well as the specifics of the various HEW Appropriations bills. A careful analysis of the Kerr and Rivlin Reports underscores how much involvement the Federal Government will have in the funding of higher education in the decade of the '70s. Even the most conservative estimates see direct Federal assistance being increased three-fold to almost 13 billion a year by the late 1970s. The implementation of the Kerr Report is spelled out in detail in the Reid-Brademus Bill. Even though the short-range prognosis for passage of such legislation is not good, the long-range necessity for increased Federal support for all of higher education is recognized and I am quite convinced will become a reality.

How we can organize or direct our own Congressional relations

program is dependent on a number of variables—the size, the mission, and the geographical location of the institution and what kinds of programs it has which attract Federal support. Also highly important is the make-up and mood of the institution's state delegation. From what we have done at Iowa, I will attempt to extract a few generalities which I hope would have some universal applicability.

Our "low-key" program began in early 1969 as one program whose primary objective was to establish and maintain a line of communication with the Iowa delegation. In the beginning, at least, the emphasis was on communication *to inform*. Any efforts *to persuade* were to be attempted only after I felt I had established some rapport with the members of the delegation. As Vice President Spriestersbach once said to me, "We will have arrived when the members of our delegation ask us what we think on key issues."

Vice President Spriestersbach's management philosophy also was important and very sound. In a memo to me he stated:

A liaison person is the go-between for two or more other persons. This means he must determine what it is that is to be carried from one to the others. This involves staffing of issues and requires that someone determine how the staffing is to be done. There is no precise model, of course, but there certainly is more to the business than creating the office and sending the representative off to conquer the world in his own light. Further, there must be close follow-up if the program is to be successful. Good relationships properly initiate inquiries. Nothing kills the relationship quicker and more surely than lack of follow-through. In summary, don't set up a liaison arrangement unless you are prepared to go all the way in staff support.

With this management charter and understanding, I set about to meet each member of the delegation—seven representatives and two senators—and to establish personal contact on a continuing basis with each Congressman and his staff. My first meeting was made easier since I arrived at Iowa in time to participate in the second annual University of Iowa-Iowa Congressional Delegation luncheon which was held in Washington in February 1969. This luncheon was chaired by President Howard Bowen and had as its University participants, Vice President Spriestersbach and Dean of the Faculties Philip Hubbard. The idea for such an annual luncheon had been conceived by Vice President Spriestersbach and at this second annual session such specific items as the Miller Bill, indirect costs on Federal contracts, delivery of health care, and student attitudes were covered. I was introduced as the new Director of Agency Liaison, and I was given a kind of parental blessing before the group which proved to be invaluable. Our third annual luncheon with the delegation in Washington was held in early March 1970. Participants included President Willard Boyd, Vice President

Spriestersbach, and Vice President for Health Affairs Robert Hardin. At this meeting we discussed such areas as the state of university finance, the impact of Federal funding on the university, and the problems of health care. Again, our participants came away from this meeting, as they had the year before, fully convinced of the validity of meeting with the delegation as a group on its home ground at least once a year. Such a meeting provides a forum for the University's President to report on the State of the University. Also, it gives the three or four chief administrators of the University an opportunity to interact with the delegation as a group, and as you might suspect, the group chemistry is quite different from that exhibited by individuals in the privacy of their own offices.

As I have already stated, I was introduced to the group at the February 1969 luncheon. I returned to Washington in April 1969 and subsequently every six or eight weeks for the remainder of the year. This has now become my pattern—six trips a year to "The Hill." Each time I see and talk to each member of the delegation and/or his staff. In each of my trips I have items to cover with the delegation both generally and specifically. For instance, it became evident quite early that one of my major tasks was to inform our delegation about the impact of the tax reform bill on higher education. As early as February 1969 we had analyzed what the bill would do to private giving to the University. This information was transmitted both personally and in writing to our delegation. When the "panic button" on tax reform was pushed by a number of educational organizations in July 1969, there was no need to pound on our delegation's collective ear. They already had had the word. Thus, I underscore that our program is on-going and is not geared to "crisis management."

Another item I have covered more than once with the members of the delegation is the issue of "student unrest." By citing what the University is doing to police its own, we are asking our delegation not to be a party to legislation which would strap us.

Of course, appropriations always is an important subject. We have prepared and made available to our delegation factual material about HEW appropriations and what they mean to the University. Within the framework of appropriations we have made a good case for more NDEA loans, more facilities grants, and the retention of graduate fellowships; and we established the importance of the concept of institutional grants to the University.

Quite obviously, I cannot make all of the policy decisions for the University about what is important and what our Congressional priorities should be. I am in constant touch with my President, our Vice Presidents, our State Relations Director at the State Capitol (we certainly had to articulate our state and national stands on legislation),

and our Public Information Officer among others. Equally important is my liaison with people such as Jack Morse at the American Council on Education, Ralph Huitt at National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, and Chuck Kidd of the Federal Relations Council at the Association of American Universities. My contact with these gentlemen and others in Washington is by letter, by phone, and by personal contact. I have evolved a system where I now check in with these representatives of our educational organizations each time when I first arrive in Washington and before I head up to "The Hill." Thus, I have the benefit of up-to-date briefings on what is happening. Also, I have found I can assist these associations in transmitting information which they may want to get to specific Iowa Congressmen. So, I am in a broader sense a representative of *all* higher education.

In all my dealings with our delegation I have tried to stress *personal contact*. I have attempted to follow the advice of my great teacher, Aristotle, and to recognize that "as members of the Public Assembly [my Iowa delegation] may be taken as an instance of a judge of the future. . . ." Fortunately, I have a relatively small delegation, and it has been possible for me to get to know these individuals personally. This has been essential since I first had to establish my relationship with them. After all, I had been absent from Iowa for twenty years, and although my family had been prominent in the state for 120 years, I still was viewed in some quarters as that outlander who had been out in radical (?) California!

Much of my talk, at least initially, was designed to build an understanding of Iowa's problems today. I had to practice the art of good listening and to sometimes hold my tongue when I was confronted by a "way-out" idea from one of the delegation.

Ours is a very diverse delegation ranging from two liberals, Senator Harold Hughes and Representative John Culver to two ultra-conservatives, Representatives H. R. Gross and William J. Scherle. Yet, because I was bound and determined to listen and reflect, I think I can now say I have some basis of communication with them all.

Further, our delegation has some important committee assignments, and frankly our "program objectives" are tied to these assignments. Senator Jack Miller is on the Senate Finance Committee and was an important contact on tax reform. In fact, most people in the educational associations in Washington told me Senator Miller, who is a tax attorney, probably demonstrated the best understanding about tax reform of anyone on that committee. Representative Neal Smith is on the powerful House Appropriations Committee and more importantly on the sub-committee on HEW appropriations. Representative William J. Scherle is on the House Education and Labor Committee, and Senator Harold Hughes is on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare

Committee. With our sudden interest in environmental problems, Representative John Kyl's assignment to and his seniority on the House Interior and Insular Committee is very significant to us. Representative Wiley Mayne is on the House Judiciary Committee, and I can assure you he has heard about our desire for a TIAA/CREF national charter. Representative Culver, who is casting an eye toward the Senate, has been of invaluable assistance in opening doors to such other Congressmen as Carl Perkins, Chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, Edith Green of Oregon and Patsy Mink of Hawaii who have been most interested in the positive steps we have taken to handle student unrest. I have had interesting and informative lectures on fiscal responsibility from the Dean of our delegation, Representative H. R. Gross. And, of course, our own Representative Fred Schwengel, himself a former teacher, has been a good friend who will initiate inquiries to Federal agencies, help us try to establish our eligibility for soon to be surplus Federal buildings, and who has introduced on at least five different occasions this past year into the *Congressional Record* speeches, statements, and comments which reflect "what is happening at The University of Iowa."

Personal contact does not begin or end in Washington. In addition to our luncheon and my frequent trips to "The Hill," we also encourage our delegation—as *individuals*—to visit the campus for at least a day each year. Two examples of the success of this program this past year were the visits of Senator Miller and Representative Smith. The Senator is a great football fan, and he was delighted to be our guest over Homecoming last October. He was my guest at our annual Omicron Delta Kappa breakfast. He was President Boyd's guest at a Law College Coffee Hour. He enjoyed our 19 to 18 victory over Michigan State. And, he responded enthusiastically to a two-hour briefing he was given on the problems of the University and the possible solutions to these problems. This January before Congress reconvened, Representative Smith was on campus for a full day being briefed on the financial problems of the University and those areas of health care in which the Congressman has a deep interest as a member of the HEW Appropriations Sub-Committee. It is my hope that after this election is over we can expand and intensify the meaning of these campus visits. As a *national resource university*, we are not the exclusive province of one Representative and two Senators. We are the concern of the entire delegation.

Just as these on-campus briefings are tailored to the specific interests of the individuals, so is the continuing dialog I maintain with the members of the delegation when I am not in Washington. One of my most valuable sources of data is our University's News Bureau output. Whenever I find a news release which I think will interest one of our

delegation, I fire it off to Washington with a personal note. Representative Kyl and I have "a real thing" going on pollution, and Representative Smith seems genuinely pleased to have our frequent releases from the health sciences.

Now after almost two years, how do I measure the effectiveness of this program? Yes, we have a file of letters which are very laudatory. Yes, our program has won a national award for excellence. No, we have not established a permanent Washington office, and given the nature of our delegation, we don't think we need one.

But, more importantly, I am proud to say "we have arrived." Members of our delegation do ask us our opinion on pending legislation, and we reply in factual terms. Our delegation has responded to requests we have made on specific bills. I am not brash enough to feel we have changed many votes or saved many souls, but I do think our line of communication is open. We know our delegation, what we can expect from it, and they in turn have a much better knowledge and, I think, appreciation of *what* we are doing and *why* we are doing it. Certainly the delegation now knows the University is a national resource which is their concern, and which is funded twenty-five percent by Federal monies.

One personal example of the "pay-off" in our program might be worth mentioning. About a year ago, as I started to leave Congressman Scherle's office after a brisk debate on "things educational," the Congressman turned to me and said, "I certainly appreciate your visits. You know I am on the House Education and Labor Committee, and here you are the only person from higher education who ever comes around to see me. We may not always agree but, at least, we have the opportunity to talk."

Maybe this reaction is more typical than we think. Perhaps you should reflect on what you have been doing recently to build understanding with your Congressmen—that elite who make up Aristotle's Public Assembly.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Dean Joseph L. McCarthy raised the issue of student unrest as a problem in public relations. In reply Dr. Arnstein pointed out that, although "the youth culture" expresses itself in ways distressing to us all, there is "much justification" for student alienation in the slowness of universities to respond to changing needs. Mr. Cornell agreed that "our colleges and universities . . . are in crying need of some basic overhaul," and added that "higher education right now in terms of its public identity . . . is probably at its lowest point in American history." We must, he added, explain all this to the public as best we can.

Dean Daniel Alpert objected to Mr. Cornell's statement that universities "have not recognized where Washington is." In Illinois the College of

Agriculture created and maintained land support by working with the farmers, but now 94 per cent of the population in Illinois is urban. The universities, he continued, designed the National Science Foundation in their own image, with basic research as the central object of our academic community; but "while we elevated American science to be at the very top level in the whole world, we did so at the expense of separating it from the rest of our society." Society is now going to insist that somehow academia respond to the need for applied research and thus tie itself to the real world. It is part of the job of public relations, Dean Alpert concluded, not only to represent the needs of the universities to society but also the needs of society to the universities. Mr. Cornell agreed that this should be, and in fact has been, part of his job.

PANEL DISCUSSION: OUR JUNIOR OFFICERS OF INSTRUCTION

[The panelists were Dean Ian C. Loram, Dear Francis M. Boddy, Dear Elmer F. Baumer, and Dean C. W. Minkel. Dean Minkel also chaired the panel. A general discussion, summarized below, followed the panelists' remarks. This panel and the following panel on "Time for Change" were presented on 22 and 23 October, respectively.—Ed.]

DEAN IAN C. LORAM

Teaching assistants at the University of Wisconsin in Madison began to organize and seek formal recognition about 1967. Nothing much came of this at first. They claimed at the beginning a fairly large number of members, but since the group never actually managed to do anything for some time, members began to fall away. And actually the organization was, I think, pretty much moribund until February of 1969, when one of the members of the State Legislature suggested that the out-of-state remission of fees for teaching assistants, which for some time has been automatic at the University of Wisconsin, be revoked for the second semester of that year. This of course immediately revived the Teaching Assistants Association, and not surprisingly and with some justification, they rallied round and began to threaten a strike if they were not recognized as a union.

The administration of the university, rightly or wrongly after considerable deliberations, feared that a strike based on refusal to recognize a union could well be disastrous for that semester, in that it might very well pull in, although I was not privy to these deliberations, a great many members of the other unions on the campus, such as the custodians, the hospital workers, and the Teamsters.

In view of this possibility the administration drew up an agreement with the Teaching Assistants Association on April 26th of that year to permit an election on the campus for or against a union under the rules of the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission.

One of the stipulations was that this election would be on a departmental basis. In any department in which a majority of the teaching assistants voted to have the Teaching Assistants Association represent them, the Teaching Assistants Association would then represent the teaching assistants as their bargaining agent.

The election was held. The vote was rather overwhelming, I think—there were only three departments in which the vote went against the

Teaching Assistants Association, and so the Teaching Assistants Association became a union and the legally recognized bargaining agent for all the teaching assistants in the University.

In June of that year negotiations began between the University and the Teaching Assistants Association for a contract.

I was involved in these negotiations. Although not a member of the bargaining team, I attended, I suppose, almost every negotiating session from June until January or February of 1970.

At any rate it dragged on and on, with all kinds of hang-ups and problems.

And finally in February, we reached an impasse and the Teaching Assistants Association decided that it would take a strike vote. It did so. They voted for a strike, and on (I think) 16 March 1970, they went on strike in the ordinary organized labor manner. They picketed. The Teamsters Union at first honored their picket lines. We have a bus transportation system on campus from outlying parking lots. For about ten days the bus drivers struck in sympathy, and then the economic squeeze got to them and they went back to work. However, the Teamsters people driving supply trucks, particularly to the science departments, honored the picket lines. The Chemistry Department was desperate because its supply of nitrogen was practically exhausted.

The strike went on with no particular violence through Easter vacation and then lasted for about a week after vacation, at which time a contract was signed between the University and the Teaching Assistants Association. This is now in effect on a campus-wide basis. The contract called, however, for certain negotiations to take place on a departmental basis and these are still going on.

There are at the moment, I think, only three or possibly four departments which have concluded some kind of arrangement for this academic year or for this contract year—whichever you prefer. The contract comes up for negotiation again in April.

I happen to be fairly close to this sort of thing because in addition to my duties in the Graduate School, where incidentally we have very little to do with the teaching assistants, I happen also to be chairman of a department, and we are still involved in bargaining with our Teaching Assistants Affiliate.

The problems involved at the moment, I suppose, could be oversimplified by saying that the Teaching Assistants Association is not the least bit satisfied with its present contract for the simple reason that it got very little of what it originally was hoping to get and was bargaining for. I think some of this is due to the fact that it is normal bargaining procedure to ask for twice as much or demand twice as much as you expect to get and then say you are satisfied with two-thirds of that.

Presumably the Teaching Assistants Association will come up with a great many more demands in April.

If you are interested I can just briefly indicate some of the things that are involved in the present agreement.

One of the really big problems in the negotiations was what is called Educational Planning, which originally meant that the Association wanted to decide what a given course, in which teaching assistants had a large or in some cases a majority role, should be. What came out of that in the agreement was this: "It is in the interests of the University Community to ensure that there are mechanisms in each department that give students and teaching assistants an opportunity to participate in meaningful ways in educational planning. Such departmental mechanisms shall be developed by the faculties of each department on the Madison Campus in collaboration with the students and teaching assistants involved in the course." However, it was also agreed that such mechanisms shall not infringe upon the ultimate responsibility of a Faculty for curriculum and course conduct. This latter provision is one that the Association will probably try to get rid of when they come around in April to bargain for a new contract.

Then there are the questions of job rights, e.g., appointments. We have agreed that teaching assistants will be supported for four years. The Teaching Assistants Association in its initial bargaining proposed or demanded that a teaching assistant be appointed for the duration of his graduate career or for ten years, whichever was the longest.

Now guarantees of years of support include support granted as a fellow, research assistant, project assistant, or a trainee prior to the receipt of a teaching assistantship; so, if someone has had three years of some kind of support before he becomes a teaching assistant, he is therefore entitled to one more year only. And most departments in the University, as perhaps in yours, have some policy as to how long a department will support any graduate student, teaching assistant or not.

Another big problem was the question of evaluation of teaching performance. We have a rather complicated system for that. I will not go into all the details, but it involves what is known as the Teaching Assistants Review Committee in each department. This Committee, which comprises equal numbers of faculty, teaching assistants, and undergraduates, makes recommendations as to the competence or incompetence of a teaching assistant. Here we are running into a real problem because the Teaching Assistants Association interprets the language of the agreement to mean that these recommendations shall be binding upon the faculty of the department, whereas the faculty assumes that these are only recommendations to the department and that the department will make the final decision. This will probably

lead to the Teaching Assistants Association filing a grievance against all departments.

Then there is a problem of seniority, which is not as grave as some. There is also a problem of work surroundings. Originally the Association came up with a forty-one page report on what they felt work surroundings, work safety, and health surroundings ought to be. I will just quote one instance of that.

"On seat dimensions. The height or distance from floor to seat should be adjustable in a range of fourteen to eighteen inches minimum. Physiological studies have shown that a seat that is too high causes the feet to dangle and places too much stress on the tissues on the bottom of the thigh and on the muscles of the torso used in maintaining balance. Similarly a seat which is too low forces the knee up into an acute angle which restricts circulation. Since individuals differ both in relative height and in the proportion of their limbs, a range of adjustment is imperative." Well, that has since long gone by the board. The teaching assistants claimed afterwards that this was really not intended seriously. I am glad it wasn't.

But the question of work surroundings is a matter which is bargainable on the department level. The question of how much office space, which is a perfectly legitimate grievance as far as I am concerned, or a complaint regarding how many teaching assistants to an office and so on—these are valid complaints that I have every sympathy with. And I would like to give them all the space they need if it were available, which unfortunately it is not.

Then there is a question, and a rather elaborate one, involving four different steps for grievances and arbitrations. There is a problem also, one which they are quite exercised about, and perhaps with some justification, concerning a health insurance plan. We don't have one for them at the moment. The agreement stated that the University would ask the legislature for a fund to subsidize such a health plan. I don't think we are going to get very far with that. However, some health plan may very well come into being next year, and this is tied up with the question of work load. It is possible that the administration will next year or the following year insist that all teaching assistants' appointments be one-half time, and this is tied up with the health plan.

At the moment, of course, appointments and work loads vary from department to department, from college to college. It is a terribly complex system, and this makes for variations in the stipends of teaching assistants because there is an enormously complicated stipend chart for language departments, another for math, another for English, and another one for this one and another one for that one. So a standard work load may be established in addition to an increase in stipend depending on the number of hours taught, which is logical enough.

In addition to the fact that the teaching assistants from out of state automatically get remission of out-of-state fees, which at the University of Wisconsin are \$2,128, they now receive what amounts to a remission of in-state fees—except for the so-called incidental fees for belonging to the union, health service, and so forth. This remission, which is linked to the number of credit hours a student takes, doesn't mean a great increase in take-home pay, but it does give the student a break on income tax.

The last thing that I would like to mention about the agreement is the "no strike" clause which the assistants fought bitterly until the very end but which they finally agreed to. I suspect we have not heard the last of that.

After my colleagues have spoken, I will try to answer any questions you might have. The problems we see at the moment for next year are the health plan, the work load, which may be settled by a dictum of the administration, and the size of classes, which is a real problem because the agreement mentions that sections of a course taught by a teaching assistant must at the end of three weeks average out to nineteen, with a maximum of twenty-four. This of course forced us to turn away a number of students.

Just one brief illustration. While my department, which is German, voted at least two to one to have the Teaching Assistants Association represent them, two or three weeks ago eighteen out of thirty-four teaching assistants distributed a statement to all graduate students and faculty to the effect that they were dissatisfied with the way the Teaching Assistants Association was representing their interests and exhorting the department faculty to not enter any further agreement until the eighteen had their chance to have their say—and eighteen is a little better than half. Whether this is a trend or not, I do not know.

I don't necessarily want to get rid of the Teaching Assistants Association although I must admit I am of the opinion that this sort of thing is out of place in the academic world. But I may be a little old fashioned. The teaching assistants had their grievances, and they still have them up to a point, I believe. It is going to be a sticky situation for some time to come.

DEAN FRANCIS M. BODDY

Among the four of us at least, I seem to be next in line because while we have not by any means approached the formality of contract signing that the University of Wisconsin has had, I think we are facing the same kind of problem, but, as always, in a somewhat different way.

I gather from what Dean Loram has said that the trigger for action came from outside the University. That is, there was a legislative ac-

tion, and then the Kent State tragedy last spring affected us all.

In our own case, the teaching assistants union—or, as it is officially called, the Association of Teaching and Research Assistants—did not grow out of any wide-spread resistance or response to pressures from outside the University. It arose primarily out of the kinds of problems that dramatize the relationship of the teaching assistants to their own departments.

In our case the grievances of the teaching assistants were real and are still present to some degree, although we have, I think, managed to react in such a way as at least to lead the assistants to believe that we are trying to face up to their kind of problems. Let me just itemize a few of the kinds of complaints which I have thought in a very real sense to be legitimate and long overdue for solution.

The University puts its best foot forward in recruiting graduate students; and when we are recruiting the new graduate students, we emphasize very much the benefits of the scholarships, the traineeships, and the other kinds of support programs. In some departments teaching assistantships are also available to first-year graduate students. First-year students are not usually put in charge of a class, but they may be used as laboratory supervisors or paper graders.

One of the assistants' major complaints was that while we were very eager in pointing out the advantages and spelling out the good sense of the university in providing these ways of supporting graduate students to the incoming graduate student, we were not very well tuned to taking care of the ones that we already had, with respect to reappointments. And one of the very real grievances is that, while we all abide by the April 1st-April 15th kind of deadline for offering appointments to incoming graduate students, the on-board graduate students are sometimes waiting as late as August or September to find out whether they have a job for that next academic year. And in a large part this was something that the departments have got into because of slovenly procedures, certainly not from malice, and certainly not in many cases because of lack of information about the assistant's performance.

We were able to help the situation by some memos from the Dean and some pressures on the colleges themselves to try and get the departments to notify assistants of their reappointment as soon as possible. In some cases, however, it was not possible to make all these appointments by April 15th because the enrollment for the fall could not be ascertained. At our university, as I suspect in many other universities, the teaching assistant is the expandable part of the labor force. Sometimes it is not until an increased enrollment becomes evident in September, and you can persuade the Vice-President for Academic Administration or the Dean of your college to provide some

more money for teaching assistants to handle the unexpected or at least the unplanned for load, that the last appointments can be made.

The second kind of problem is due to the ambivalent position of the teaching assistant. And I am talking now about the one that has had some experience and has become essentially a section instructor. In a sense he is a member of the faculty, yet in other ways he is a student. At the University of Minnesota as at the University of Wisconsin, the health services provided for such people were due to the fact they were students and not full faculty. Yet the assistants were concerned about having the same privileges as the faculty.

A much more difficult problem that bothers the teaching assistant is the wide disparity in the work load between departments and across colleges. Even they realize that there are dangers and difficulties of going into this on an across-the-board basis, the contract kind of negotiation. We assume that a teaching assistant who is an assistant to the teacher—that is, who grades papers, does clerical work, looks up bibliographies, supervises examinations, etc., is expected to put in a twenty-hour week or, as we state it, a maximum of twenty hours. For assistants who are in charge of a class or section we assume that six hours of classroom teaching is half-time. We expect our full-time instructors, for example, to teach twelve. And yet this varies greatly across the university. In some fields assistants are overworked; they are pushed beyond the twenty hours or beyond the six hours of classroom instruction called for by a half-time appointment. On the other hand the reality of the market is that we cannot take a single figure. My colleagues in chemistry tell me if they had advertised that we require all teaching assistants in chemistry to work twenty hours a week, our department would be up in arms. Our prospective graduate assistants would go to Illinois or Ohio State or other institutions. In my own Department of Economics, we try to assess the load equally; we typically ask not more than fifteen hours a week from the people doing the hourly kind of jobs. On the other hand in many departments the work load is heavier. The problem of unequal loads is difficult to settle by means of a university-wide contract.

The third problem of the teaching assistants is whether they are faculty or not. And this involves the whole process of representation on committees and in department meetings. Are they to be voting or are they just to express their views in curriculum committees and the kind of committees that determine text books and class procedures in large classes. In this area, they have a very legitimate interest, and there is hardly anyone better informed about the problem of teaching on the elementary level than the teaching assistant who in many universities is carrying a major burden of this kind of work.

Again we have tried to handle this by persuading the departments

to build this kind of representation into their formal and informal procedures. But such an arrangement calls for a flexibility that would be difficult to write into a contract on even a college-wide basis to say nothing of a university-wide basis.

I suggest that one problem of the teaching assistants is that nobody really informs them what is expected of them. This information is difficult to put out from a central office because the conditions across a large university such as ours make it impossible to spell this out in any meaningful fashion for the university as a whole. And so what we have tried to do is to have the departments first give a copy of the appointment form to the student. This is to be supplemented by a statement from the department saying that this is what we expect you to do, that we are going to judge your performance by following specified criteria, that we have the following procedures for reviewing your performance and informing you how you are coming along with respect to these criteria.

This is the kind of thing any good personnel officer could have told us twenty-five years ago if we had bothered to ask him.

The second thing is that teaching assistants are also required to be graduate students, and as part of the qualifications for continuing as assistants they have to perform satisfactorily as graduate students. Well, what is satisfactory performance? Again we have tried to have the departments spell out as best they can to the students the expectations of the departments with respect to what is acceptable performance as a graduate student, what mechanisms will be used to judge this performance, and what steps will be taken to either admonish or correct or disassociate themselves from the student who does not perform well. All these things add up really to a host of problems that I think we have largely overlooked.

When the teaching assistants at our institution were first organized, they were gung-ho for labor unions in the strictest sense. And, moreover, very serious questions were raised as to whether they could affiliate themselves with the Teamsters' Union, which had the most power and the ability to stop deliveries to the university, or with the American Federation of Teachers, which had finally recognized union power in the education field across our state, or whether they should go the direction of the AAUP. Our AAUP Chapter, which happens to be the largest in the country, was interested in the group and named two of the members of ASTRA to the executive board of our AAUP and has worked closely with them. I still think that it is an open question as to whether or not this kind of attitude will persist, but for the time being, at least, ASTRA has decided not to be a bargaining union.

At the beginning, ASTRA was not an across-the-university organization, but was highly concentrated in the social sciences, particularly

sociology, and, surprisingly perhaps, in the biological sciences, because of bad management of relationships with teaching assistants in some biological science departments, and in a few other areas. Now as a result of last spring's strike, ASTRA is becoming a much more general organization, because it was able to bring into the organization a good many of the active teaching assistant types who were active in our spring 1970 strike, which was by and large a very gentlemanly operation, I might say.

What of the future? Well, we have got past the most dangerous stage, I think, which is to have an organization with a strong union bias for the negotiation of a strict contract and therefore the adjudication of grievances under a contract. We got past that stage because it turned out that the problems that originally excited the assistants could be handled not perfectly, but reasonably well perhaps, without a contract. Some other crisis, however, may get us into this situation.

The second thing that developed was that we had to persuade everyone to listen to the teaching assistants. The Vice-President for Academic Administration listened to them, and after he had had a number of meetings with them, he finally said: "Most of your problems I am very much interested in, but I am a very busy man and I would like to consider your problems not at the initial stages of complaint but when some sort of proposed solutions have been worked out. So why don't you go to the man named Boddy over in the Graduate School, and he will act as the sort of liaison, listener, negotiator, proposer, and so on with respect to you and your perceived problems because you are all in Graduate School and the Graduate School has more than a passing interest in the treatment of such substantial numbers of our ablest graduate students."

Somewhere around 2,500 individuals out of a graduate population of about 8,000 hold graduate assistant appointments. ASTRA, although not broadly representative across all graduate fields nor large in members, does represent the assistants' major interests. And so we have been meeting with ASTRA now over a period of two and a half years, and we both have learned a lot. We have learned once you have got past the initial language—and in this case it has been very polite and firm—once you get past the initial language, I must say that the first solutions that ASTRA tends to propose for very real problems are rather naive solutions, but the ASTRA representatives turn out to be in fact very good solid citizens.

One trouble with all such organizations is that the general population is a transient population. Unfortunately, they are not transient enough, for, they take too long to finish their degrees. But the leadership is transient, too, because it is a largely unexplored kind of job that takes a tremendous amount of time by some very able people to

make the thing work from the students' side. The demands of this sort of very dedicated leadership, have added, for at least three or four such people, a year to the time required to obtain their degrees.

The present organization is much better off because, as a result of last year's spring strike, they have enlisted the support of a much larger group of interested and somewhat dedicated people, and they have managed to delegate and share the burdens in such a way as to be more effective. But it means that we have to re-educate a new group each year as to the history and background of where we are now and why the bad decisions, as they see them, were made. We have to re-educate the TA's in the problems of looking for new decisions and solutions.

I think myself the worst thing that can happen is (a) not listening to the TA's and (b) assuming that they are wrong. I think in many cases they are correct, but they may not be able to say it in such a way as to really tell us what is the real problem. They have a sort of gut feeling that there must be something badly wrong, and the examples they use in many cases are not very persuasive, but when you start looking, you find a real basis for their complaints.

I don't know how many of you have the organized kind of thing that exists at Wisconsin, but my plea is that the problems are there whether they have resulted in organization or not; whether they have resulted in any overt actions or whether, as at Minnesota, there is just a latent unease and unhappiness affecting a large and influential group of our best graduate students; and that organized and cooperative efforts to identify and solve the problems should be high among the priorities of graduate schools.

DEAN ELMER F. BAUMER

The growth and development of the teaching assistants system has become so deeply ingrained in the operation of most major universities that to correct some of its abuses will require a general overhaul of many of our present policies. It is somewhat alarming that a program with such laudable objectives now finds itself with some serious problems calling for rather major reforms. During the past five years, there have been many excellent studies on the use and misuse of the TA. The recent study by HEW and its very excellent bibliography, is must reading for anyone seriously concerned with this subject.

My assignment is to present the pleasant and unpleasant developments on our campus regarding TA's. At Ohio State as on many other campuses an *ad hoc* Committee spent considerable time during the past year studying the TA program. A report was issued last June, and a number of its recommendations are presently being implemented.

The mutual benefits of the present TA system are well recognized by the academic community. Many if not most graduate students could not pursue their graduate studies without financial assistance, and most universities could not provide instruction to the large number of undergraduate students without, at this stage, the assistance of TA's. But there is serious doubt as to how well this concept is recognized and understood by undergraduate students and their parents. It seems safe to say that the general public does not favor the TA system of instruction as presently carried out on many campuses. One might also add that legislators do not recognize the fact that their Spartan attitude toward supporting higher education has contributed directly to the increased use of TA's in the classroom. One significant contribution to the recent campus unrest has been this lack of sufficient financial support which has forced state universities to rely increasingly on TA's in order to meet their obligation to offer every citizen of the state the opportunity to attend the state university. When instructional funds are inadequate, the usual remedy is one or all of the following: 1) increase the class size; 2) hire more TA's because the budget will not permit hiring permanent staff; 3) close courses.

The impact of statistics concerning student enrollment is generally not understood by the general public. At Ohio State the Autumn Quarter undergraduate student enrollment increased 21% from 1950 to 1960 and 93% from 1960 to 1970. But more significant is the fact that these percentages represent an increase of 3,261 students from 1950 to 1960 and an increase of 17,329 from 1960 to 1970. Because of the modest enrollment increases from 1950 to 1960, most universities were not provided with sufficient funds to add permanent staff for 17,300 additional students.

During the last ten years the number of programs offered and the number of courses at most large universities have expanded significantly. This is not to say that these new programs are not worthwhile, but it must be conceded that in too many instances they are relatively expensive and drain funds from existing programs. Furthermore, universities generally have not developed a method by which some existing programs can be phased out. Much of the pressure for these new programs or courses comes from off-campus interests which generally do not realize the effect of their proposals on the overall operation of the university. This is not to advocate a prohibition of new programs; however, more recognition of the effect of the addition of such programs on a university's ability to provide a high-quality instructional staff is necessary.

The present problems of TA's cannot be blamed wholly on any one cause. Concerns vary from department to department and from college to college. It is safe to say, however, that the present stipend level is

the most significant contribution to their unhappiness. TA stipend levels are traditionally quite slow to move. During the past five or six years the stipend levels have changed very little while the consumer price index rose almost 30%. In effect, this has reduced the TA's real income 25 to 30%. This matter is becoming quite critical since the consumer price index rose 5 points in 1968, 6.5 points in 1969, and has already increased 8.3 points in 1970. In addition, TA's are very sensitive about their fee waivers and are easily disturbed when state officials discuss this subject in the public press without a full explanation of the reasons for such waivers. Discussions of this subject last year brought about a state-wide meeting of graduate students and served as a rallying point for a strong, cohesive, state-wide graduate student association. Since this subject has not been ventilated in recent months, the activities of the state-wide groups seem to have waned. The net effect, however, was the organization of graduate student councils on most campuses offering graduate degrees in the state.

Many TA's feel that too much is expected of them for their stipends. This concern varies from department to department, and these departmental differences also contribute to the problem. The fact that TA's do almost nothing in a few instances is a real irritant to those who feel overworked. A substantial number of TA's on our campus feel that their duties and assignments are unreasonable. They complain that their teaching load is equal to, or heavier than, that of most permanent staff; and that they must also do research and reading if they are to make any progress toward their degree and must also spend considerable reading time in preparation for their teaching assignment. They are given committee assignments without thought of released time and feel that the expectations of their work performance are based more on a clerical standard than on a faculty standard. As one TA told me recently, "We are shoved into the medieval grand old idea of a university but with none of the advantages. We are simply a part of the wage-earning class." TA's feel strongly that their package of fringe benefits is inadequate. They want library privileges, parking privileges, bookstore discounts, health and life insurance, and in many cases, better office facilities.

TA's are becoming sensitive about the criticism generally leveled at them for poor teaching. They feel it is not possible to do the kind of teaching job they would like to do and also meet their own class responsibilities. Consequently, their own progress toward their degree is slowed to a crawl and with little expectation that things will get better in the future. Once caught up in the TA system they feel beaten by it. To get out means no income or fee waiver and to continue means years of unstimulating, repetitious teaching. One TA described his feelings as that of "a bud that never bloomed." Another TA com-

mented that since he seldom if ever saw a permanent staff member teaching at his level, he felt he was being overtrained for a job that didn't exist.

Many TA's also resent the fact that they are given little or no supervision in the execution of their instructional assignments. This is especially true for the beginning TA. It will be most difficult for a large department to provide the necessary supervision, especially if it has added TA's at whatever rate has been necessary to meet its freshman teaching obligations. At this point TA supervisors mean the addition of permanent staff without a substantial improvement in the department's ability to meet its teaching responsibility.

Teaching assistants are also becoming aware of the effect of an expanded TA program on their own future market. They view with alarm the present tight job market and feel that replacing permanent staff with more TA's jeopardizes their own future job opportunities. It is important to review the growth in enrollment with the growth in staff positions. Departments pursued various courses of action in this respect. In some cases staff vacancies were abandoned and shifted into an expanding TA program. In other departments the increased student load was handled with a modest increase in permanent staff and substantial increase in TA's. Still other departments, generally not involved with providing major segments of freshman teaching, found adequate funds to meet their increased obligation by adding permanent staff.

This shift in the faculty-graduate student ratio can be serious. In too many cases the addition of more and more TA's has overburdened the permanent staff with a graduate student advising load that is unreasonable. Under these circumstances graduate faculty cannot spend adequate time advising graduate students and have little or no time for scholarly research. This problem of providing enough senior staff to advise graduate students in the department is especially acute for departments serving as "service" to other colleges. There exists the temptation to satisfy this service load with TA's, thereby significantly affecting the faculty-graduate student ratio.

The risk and uncertainty associated with TA appointments in many fields has contributed to the present unrest. In far too many instances the *modus operandi* has been to handle TA appointments on a rather informal, quarter-to-quarter basis. Such practices have caused many TA's to look seriously at strong union type organizations to partially alleviate this problem. Graduate students feel they make commitments on an annual basis with respect to housing and for several years with respect to the completion of their graduate programs. Strong pressures will be exerted by TA's in the future for a commitment by the university to support them over an extended period of time provided their

teaching performance is satisfactory. Annual commitments would seem to be the minimum.

This raises the question of how many TA reappointments should be made to a graduate student. Our review of practices currently in use leads us to suggest that the department should clearly set forth the maximum number of reappointments that will be offered. In some cases the TA system has contributed directly to the "professional graduate student." Reappointments have been made over a period of five or more years without evidence that the student has made progress toward his degree. Such reappointment limits should bring about more effective graduate student advising.

The impact of TA appointments on the "stretchout" problem for Ph.D. students has been recognized for a long time. Many students do not realize the real cost of holding a TA and thereby extend the time necessary to complete their Ph.D. degree. There is no argument with the opportunity to offer the student a reasonable teaching experience while completing the degree requirements. However, the benefits derived by the student from teaching the same course for five consecutive years is questionable. This is especially ludicrous if no supervision of the TA experience is provided.

Appointment procedures used for TA's should also be reviewed. Some uniformity in the actual appointment procedure is called for. Appointment forms along with a clear-cut statement of the TA's rights and responsibilities similar to those for all professional personnel of the university engaged in similar activities would be welcomed by all parties concerned. Procedures should also be established to handle TA grievances regarding dismissal and non-reappointment. I do not think detailed labor contracts are per se sought by TA's; but without some understanding of their rights and responsibilities the TA's will almost certainly demand them.

From my review of recent studies of the TA problem and from discussions with faculty and students I offer the following suggestions:

1. The stipend level has been entirely too sticky to avoid periodic, genuine criticism by TA's. The stipend level should be responsive to the consumer price index, or else it might be made responsive to the average salary for assistant professors in that field of specialization. The gap between the average TA stipend and the average salary of assistant professors has widened considerably during the past three years. Keeping the TA stipend at some agreed upon percentage of the average assistant professor salaries might be a reasonable approach. Graduate students are not proposing that the whole TA idea be abandoned; rather they are asking that department chairmen be required to make a more difficult decision whether to hire more TA's or more assistant professors.

Some TA's express concern that the higher stipends will bring even more demands for increased teaching time. Most TA's on our campus would become most disturbed if their teaching responsibilities were further increased.

2. A part of the remuneration for TA service might be an agreed-on dissertation-year fellowship after the student has completed his general examinations. An example of such a plan might be a teaching assistantship for three or four years followed by a dissertation-year fellowship. The dissertation-year fellowship might be viewed as a kind of paid sabbatical that would give the student the opportunity to finish his Ph.D.

3. A method must be found to assure that the TA makes reasonable progress toward his degree. In this connection each department should establish and publish the maximum number of reappointments that may be held by a graduate student. If this is clearly understood by the student and his adviser at the time the student is first appointed, such a procedure should avoid the extremely long Ph.D. programs experienced by some TA's.

4. The Graduate School should play a more active role in the TA programs. A standing committee made up of graduate faculty and TA's should be set up to act as an ombudsman for TA's. Such a committee should define maximum teaching loads and minimum stipend levels and establish criteria for appointments and reappointments. Furthermore, this committee should be given adequate power to investigate abuses of TA's if called on to do so. This committee would also publish annually the range and average TA stipend levels in each department on the campus and for departments located at sister institutions. This committee should also study and make recommendations with respect to parking privileges, bookstore discounts, insurance, etc.

5. The university should establish procedures for TA appointments that would tend to regularize them with all other teaching staff and clearly set forth the rights and responsibilities at the time of the appointment. Standard AAUP procedures should also be established for dealing with TA grievances regarding dismissal and non-reappointment.

I have tried to deal with the problems of TA's as this program is carried out on our campus today. There are many benefits to be derived by students, the university, and indeed society, by offering graduate students teaching experience while pursuing their Ph.D. degree. No one I discussed this program with would ever hint of abandoning it; however, most admit that it has been subjected to some abuses during recent years. Some corrections may be a bit painful and costly. In this latter respect we simply must communicate the merits of the TA system to the general public, especially for tax supported

institutions. Furthermore, it is time we all recognize that TA's are becoming "aware": aware of their role in the teaching commitment of the institution; aware that all platitudes about a meaningful teaching experience may rest mainly with themselves; aware of the effect that the TA system has on their rate of progress in pursuing a graduate degree; and, lastly, aware that as an organized group they presently have considerable bargaining power.

DEAN C. W. MINKEL

Time permits only a capsule summary of concerns expressed nationally and the specific situation at Michigan State University relative to graduate teaching assistants.

One feature to be recognized is that the magnitude of current problems related to graduate assistants, or to students generally, is somewhat proportional to the size of operation. We are doing something in the United States which is unusual when considered on a world-wide basis. Namely, we are providing higher education, including graduate training, to a very substantial portion of our so-called college-age population. At Michigan State University, we have a total enrollment in excess of 41,000. Our graduate student body is 8,300. Graduate assistants in 1969-70 totaled 2,266. The number of assistantships per academic unit ranges from one in several departments to 82 in another, and to a maximum of 120. When dealing with students in the thousands, or even hundreds, it must be anticipated that if only one or two per cent are genuinely "unhappy" with their experiences, complex situations are likely to result. Thus, size of operation and the resultant impersonality of relationships are probably at the root of many graduate assistant problems.

Another matter, referred to by each of the three previous speakers, is the level of graduate assistantship stipends. This topic may be of concern to faculty members as well as to the graduate assistants themselves, since teaching salaries and TA stipends are commonly funded from the same budgetary compartment. Thus, faculty-TA relationships may be involved, including the question as to what constitutes an ideal faculty-TA ratio in a given institution or department. At Michigan State University our TA stipends are of an "intermediate" category, relative to those of other institutions of comparable nature and size. We have a university-wide graduate assistantship stipend scale, but this includes three levels and a substantial range within each of these. Budget allocations are made by the Provost's Office to each of the colleges and departments, which in turn establish the individual TA stipends. The teaching assistants themselves have to date been very little involved in the process. TA stipend increases have not kept pace with the rise in cost of living, tuition charges, and remuneration for

other university personnel. As a consequence, there has been discussion of TA unionization in some quarters, but implementation of the idea does not appear imminent. Meanwhile, one administrative procedure that has been suggested is to first determine a fair ratio between faculty salaries and TA stipends, then increase each at the same percentage rate each year.

A third topic referred to repeatedly is the lack of uniformity in TA work assignments relative to a given stipend and, inversely, variable stipends for ostensibly the same commitment of time or work. It is well known that stipends often vary widely between the various departments or disciplines. No less common is a wide variance within departments and between individual professors in the amount of work expected from the TA's under their jurisdiction. In many cases, the problem may be due to a lack of bookkeeping. More generally, the assistants are simply never informed in writing concerning their specific rights and responsibilities, and procedures for the adjudication of grievances may be lacking. The question of assistantship renewal is also raised repeatedly. There is widespread concern that when assistantships are not renewed, notification is often given too late for the student either to transfer to another university or to find an alternate source of livelihood. Related issues are the procedure by which assistantships are awarded and the manner in which the work assignments are made. Are these decisions made willy-nilly, or do the TA's have a right to participate in them? At Michigan State University we are currently developing a Graduate Student Rights and Responsibilities document which pertains to all graduate students, but has particular relevance to TA's, and establishes a judicial system extending through the department, college, and university levels. Some care must, of course, be exercised in the preparation of such legislation, since excessive codification may seriously restrict desirable flexibility. It must also be realized that the preparation of such a document is an attempt to legislate a kind of behavior we should be able to take for granted—a kind of personal understanding, empathy and cooperation between the faculty, administration, and graduate students generally.

Another perennial concern on our campus, and across the country, is the status of graduate assistants relative to the federal income tax. No one seems to know in a given case whether the TA's stipend is taxable or not. Some departments seem to find ways to legitimately document an exemption—at least sometimes—while others cannot, or leave the matter entirely to the student to resolve. While the university or its departments receive criticism for lack of attention to the problem, there is probably little that can be done in view of the vague and uncertain federal legislation dealing with the subject. Perhaps the best that can be achieved is the appointment of a single individual or office

within the university with responsibility to keep abreast of court cases, maintain contact with local and regional IRS personnel, and provide counsel to graduate students as needed.

A fifth item of preoccupation in graduate schools nation-wide is the development of graduate student organizations. At Michigan State University we have no teaching assistants' union, but we do have a graduate student organization known as the Council of Graduate Students. It has been in existence for about three and one-half years and is highly effective. It has received active support from both the Graduate Council and the Graduate Office, and amiable, productive relationships have prevailed. The ideal composition, structure and procedures for graduate student organizations are, however, by no means obvious. Not all of the departments on our campus are represented within the Council of Graduate Students, even though the C.O.G.S. is organized on a departmental basis. How then are the views of graduate students from non-represented departments to be expressed? Can the organization levy a tax on all graduate students to generate operating funds, providing an open referendum is held and a majority of the voters approve? What formal relationships should exist between the graduate student organization and the various administrative units of the university concerned primarily with graduate student affairs? Once such questions have been answered, there remains the problem of continuity and stability. New student leadership emerges annually and is likely to emanate at least partially from persons disenchanted with the status quo. The new officers must exert leadership, attack injustices, and resolve problems with expediency if they are to retain the support of their constituency. After holding responsible positions for a year and experiencing the complexity of many issues, they become well-educated in university governance, mature considerably, and become valued colleagues. Then they graduate, and the cycle must start all over again. There may be no solution to this problem, since education and graduation have been designed as integral parts of the system.

Finally, consideration must be given to the overall system of graduate administration, which affects teaching assistants and other graduate students alike. The Graduate School at Michigan State University is highly decentralized, leaving most decisions to the individual colleges and departments. This has the advantage of putting graduate administration closer to the graduate student, through "home rule," and permits substantial flexibility within the graduate program. However, uniformity and consistency—for example, in TA working loads and conditions—are difficult to achieve when each academic unit constitutes an island of autonomy. It is also difficult to implement an objective internal review of individual graduate programs. Of greater

concern at M.S.U. is the need for more prompt implementation of legislation passed by the Graduate Council. At present, items approved by that body are referred through a maze of other faculty committees before eventually reaching the Board of Trustees. While some additional review may be desirable, it is clear that extensive delay between the acceptance of an idea and its eventual implementation can lead to frustration, apathy, and antagonism on the part of participating faculty members and graduate students alike. Since our campus environment is, for the most part, one in which innovation and adjustment are readily accepted, we are optimistic that most existing problems can be resolved through continuity of effort. Meanwhile, the existence of problems such as outlined herein offers no small degree of challenge and intellectual excitement.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

In response to an inquiry from Dean W. P. Albrecht, Deans Loran and Baumer reported that it was difficult to estimate the percentage or number of teaching assistants involved in the strikes at Wisconsin and Ohio State. Dean Joseph L. McCarthy volunteered to send out a questionnaire to the membership to ascertain assistantship stipends throughout the AGS. Dean Boddy called attention to the recent AAUP questionnaire on this topic and suggested that AGS wait until the AAUP study comes out. Dean Boddy further pointed out that at Minnesota there are various levels of stipends within various categories of assistantships, with the higher stipends for teaching associates who are given more advanced and responsible duties. Dean E. P. Bollier mentioned that the AGS deans could submit, to some central collection point, the data already assembled for the AAUP questionnaire. On the basis of his own experience with similar questionnaires, Dean Benjamin F. Howell questioned the dependability of the information collected by the AAUP or any other questionnaire on stipends.

PANEL DISCUSSION: TIME FOR CHANGE

[Remarks were presented by Mr. C. W. Cook, Chairman, General Foods Corporation; Dr. O. Meredith Wilson, Director, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences; and Dean George Winchester Stone, Jr. Dean W. Gordon Whaley was Chairman. A short discussion followed each panelist's remarks and is summarized after each presentation.—ED.]

MR. C. W. COOK

A speaker invariably looks around for some story to get the group on his side. If you will, I have a story from a hospital administrator who, with several doctors, had just returned from Russia. I am on a committee of the Rockefeller Foundation appointed to study various social ills, and it might be interesting to note that this committee's deliberation formed the basis of the reform bill now before Congress. We are now studying problems of health care and health insurance in the United States.

But to return to the story: It seems that an American and his wife came to Moscow for the first time and were ushered into their hotel room and as soon as the door closed his wife began to whisper to him. He said, "What in the world are you whispering about?" She said, "Did you know that these rooms are all bugged?" Well, he didn't quite believe that, but they made a very thorough search of the room. They looked behind every picture and everywhere you could think of, and they couldn't find a thing. Finally with a fit of inspiration her husband pulled back the rug and sure enough there were wires there. This annoyed him no end. In his medicine case he had some nail clippers. He got them out, cut the wires, and put the rug back. Then he and she went to sleep feeling rather triumphant that they had discovered this rather obvious ploy.

The next morning they went to check out and the man at the desk said in impeccable English: "I trust you had a restful night?" The husband answered: "Yes, we did." Then the man at the desk said: "I am very glad. Just about bedtime, the people in the room below you had the chandelier fall in the middle of their bed."

Let me come now to the reason for my addressing you today. What does a business executive, who has spent almost forty years in business, have to say that is genuinely relevant to your interests? If you were deans of schools of business or engineering, which happen to be the two schools I went to, I could talk shop with you at length on what

ways I feel your graduates are well or badly prepared—even on how I feel you should do things differently. If you were deans of undergraduate colleges, I might also have something to say because my company hires the products of these institutions, too, either directly or indirectly through the professional schools. It is true that my company does hire some products of graduate education in the arts and sciences. We hire graduates in biochemistry for our research labs; in the social sciences for our market research; in the mathematical sciences for our financial area; and in the applied arts for our advertising and package design. But these people, by and large, are specialists in the full sense—quite remote from the mainstream of managing the business.

Then I realized that I was taking too limited a view. The fact is that the graduate schools are the source of much of the faculty of the other schools, or at least much of their training; and, even more, they are the source of much of the knowledge and many of the ideas that flow through the other schools and through the press and through consultants and experts of various sorts into society as a whole and thus, by many routes, into the business system. The educational system, as a system, has much to give to the business system, and the business system has much to say in return. Your graduate schools, of course, play a central, pivotal role in the total educational system.

Some observers, nowadays, criticize the various components of our society for being overspecialized, and perhaps we are. But, perhaps, in part, it is merely our thinking that is too narrow. We think in compartments and fail to draw the connecting lines between the various components of our society.

The first point I want to make then is that I do feel we have something to say to each other. I am glad Dean Whaley invited me, and I'm glad to be here.

The second question on my mind is this: how is the educational system doing from one businessman's viewpoint in serving the needs of the business system? The educational system sends us some very good people, and, contrary to what you may have heard, business has no difficulty in getting a plentiful supply of very good people. If I had a complaint, it would be this: too often you confront us with a choice between the man who is overeducated and undertrained and the man who is undereducated and overtrained.

There has been a lot written and said about the narrow specialist. We are usually eager to hire him because he can solve immediate problems immediately, and he advances in his specialty for a while. But in too many cases he levels off and stays in his specialty because he knows too little about the areas outside it.

Not as much has been said about what might be called the narrow generalist. I believe it was F. Scott Fitzgerald who called him "that

narrowest of all specialists, the well-rounded man." During every school year our personnel department interviews several hundred rather unmotivated young people who went to college because everybody else was going to college and took liberal arts in some form because somebody told them that was a good, solid, broad background to have. Or, more realistically, because they hadn't the foggiest idea about what paths would be rewarding and appropriate.

We have relatively few places for such people. Increasingly, we hire skills or else a firm grounding in a discipline that relates to what we do. We do hire a certain number of B.A.'s with general backgrounds every year. But all too often they don't find us very interesting, and, vice versa. They usually stay for two or three years and then leave. I honestly don't know what happens to them. But what I do know is that tens of thousands of these young people drift into our nation's work force every year. I think that is a waste in one sense and a risk in another.

To support a point Dean Whaley has made in certain of his writings, I can't help believing that many of these people would be more useful to society and more satisfied with their lives if they studied something more specific—something to give them a focus, a place, and a better bargaining position in a highly competitive world.

I looked at a paper last night by Dr. Charles F. Jones, Vice Chairman of the Board of the Humble Oil Company and a member of the Board of the National Science Foundation. He said almost precisely that to a recent meeting of the National Academy of Sciences. He has stated that educators, especially in science, have been concerned only with science and that educators have been concerned only with producing more educators. He is talking about turning out people who can be used to good effect in the market place and in the councils of government as well as in the library and in the laboratory. I happen to agree with him.

This matter of young people who are not satisfied with society leads me to the third question: what is the toughest challenge currently facing both our institutions? Actually there are many challenges. The business system and the graduate schools between them have the custody, although not the control by any means, of a very high proportion of the brightest, best-educated young people in American and Canadian societies. A commencement speaker of the past would have said, "These are our future leaders." But a realist today has to add "or the bomb-throwers or the radicals or the drop-outs or the acid heads." The question I can't leave alone is: do we have any influence remaining with these young people or can we generate some to lead them toward the one and not the other?

The traditionalist in me says, "Let's show them the way." But what

one rock singer calls the "lonely voice of youth" says, "You don't know the way."

The old-fashioned moralist in me says, "Let's set them straight." But the song on my car radio advocates "Leavin' the straight life behind."

I saw a very interesting television interview the other night with President William McGill of Columbia University. President McGill said that the mood he sees among the radical student leadership on the Columbia campus is one of despair.

That doesn't always seem to be their mood in their contacts with the business community. A few months ago a young man from one of America's best campuses, who has become a sort of spokesman for some of the rebellious young people (and he has written a best seller) visited our company. One of my colleagues met him, and his attitude seemed all too typical. On the surface, at least, it did not seem to be one of despair. It seemed more a matter of arrogance, contempt, studied bad manners, and, in particular, a determination not to learn anything about the business system that might change his thoroughly negative views. My friend talked to this young man for only about five minutes. He said afterwards that he was glad it was not longer. He was strongly tempted to hit that young man right between the eyes, and that would not have solved anything.

Not long ago *The Wall Street Journal* carried a column pointing out that communication is proposed nowadays as a cure-all for various differences between the young and the old, between the campuses and the business community. But the *Journal* pointed out that communication alone is not going to close the gap in cases where people hold diametrically opposing assumptions as long as there are some who believe that our society is fundamentally a good place, even if it does have serious problems, and others who believe it is fundamentally a bad place with no redeeming features at all. It was clear that that young man who came to see us has concluded that the business system is not worth saving and he didn't see any point in listening to any evidence to the contrary. Meanwhile, the business people present did not share his view and thought that, at the very least, they should be allowed their day in court or even five minutes in court.

But if the mood among some of the brightest young people is one of despair or a defiance that reflects deep frustration, I think we must take account of that mood and acknowledge it as a fact of our lives, even if we don't necessarily share it.

What are we to do about a mood of hopelessness? We have to find some way of giving hope. I don't think making speeches will do much good. We have to act. We have to move ahead wherever we can to meet objections or aspirations wherever these are legitimate. I believe

that in the case of your institution, the educational system, and my institution, the business system, the need is the same. We must take a broader view of our basic job. We must make our institutions more relevant to the world in which we live.

Adam Smith made it clear two centuries ago that the business of business is business and never mind other concerns. Particularly, don't worry about social problems. I was amazed that Dr. Milton Friedman, the economist, has recently come out strongly for the same point of view. He wrote, in effect, "It's absolutely immoral for owners and shop-holders to do anything else but increase profits." I want it clear that I'm not prepared to dismantle the business system, abandon the profit and loss statement, turn our entire company over to the production of free goods for the poor because, among other things, that wouldn't work. And, unlike our young visitor, I find considerable merit in the present system, whatever its defects. Yet the young people are asking us: what about pollution? what about nutrition? what about poverty? what about minorities? what about the cities? We can't turn our backs on the young people who are asking these questions—not if we want to give them hope. We can't turn our backs on the problems that concern them.

The lines are still being drawn as to what the proper role of business is in the social sphere. I don't pretend to know precisely what it is, but I am convinced, and many businessmen share the view, that you can run a basically efficient, profitable business organization and still take account of the needs of the society around you.

Increasingly, my company is involving itself in efforts to do just that. Time does not permit me to elaborate, but in the discussion period, if you care to talk about that, I will be very glad to do it. The young people say, "If you're not part of the solution, you're part of the problem." It is an old saying, but they are repeating it. We are trying very hard to be part of the solution.

Just as the time-honored target of business has been profits and not much else, so I gather the time-honored target of graduate education has been original research and, often, not much else. Just as I am not proposing to abolish the profit system, so I am sure that Dean Whaley and the rest of you are not proposing to abolish the search for new knowledge and ideas. But we both are saying: let's not pursue the old goals so narrowly. The business system and the educational system must both take greater account of the needs of the social system if any of them are to survive.

DISCUSSION

Dean Francis Boddy commented that perhaps the difficulty did not lie so much in a modern economist espousing Adam Smith's views, but in the

fact that the business establishment plays under the recognized rules of the game and given that set of rules perhaps it should not be faulted for playing the game for all it's worth. He felt that, in spite of social concerns and willingness of business to occasionally do things not called for by the rules, business might be better off to work on changing the rules. By this, he said he meant that what students and others complain about in the present business system is that each individual makes decisions in regard to his own costs and income in an incentive system which excludes the interests of any third party. He felt it might be more effective to give serious consideration to various incentives or prohibitions for the whole system, the consequences of which might help alleviate some of society's problems.

Mr. Cook replied that he understood that point of view and respected it. However, he pointed out that cooperative efforts among business leaders were often more effective than waiting for matters to drag through the courts almost indefinitely. He cited two examples from his own experiences. "We can propose all sorts of laws and rules and regulations on the subject of pollution, and I am sure these will be passed in time. As an example of factors which slow down the development of fair regulatory procedures, the question of federal versus state jurisdiction relating to such problems will be fought for a long time. In the meantime the National Industrial Pollution Control Council, appointed by the President, and of which I am a member, is working voluntarily to identify problems and examine technical, financial, and legal barriers to their solution. Together we have made a lot of progress while arguments about matters of jurisdiction and laws are still going on."

As another case, he discussed the fact that all sorts of rules and laws regarding hiring ethnic groups could be made, but when the moment the chief executive of an organization says, "We have an obligation to see to it that our company does hire ethnic groups and give them all equal chances," this statement is going to get more results than the legal requirements. He cited the progress his own company had made in increasing minority group employment from 6 to 14.8 per cent with the objective of having in every community in which the company operates employee makeup consistent with the ethnic makeup of that community. "Today we have a percentage that is typical of the community. Our problem is upward mobility and not putting someone in the front office and saying, 'There's our minority group vice president.'" He affirmed that he agreed with the argument Dean Boddy had forwarded in terms of total correction, but, in the meantime, leaders of leading firms can set a base that will bring about results very much faster.

Dean W. Donald Cooke commented on Mr. Cook's remarks in regard to a large percentage of students attending college with little or no motivation and his suggestion that if they had a particular career or training in mind they would find their education more useful. Dean Cooke suggested that perhaps there was too much career orientation. He would envision that students might go to college completely without preconceptions about careers and only with an objective to become educated in the broadest sense. He feels that regardless of area of work they would find themselves better human beings with a better outlook on life and perhaps able to enjoy life more because of their education. They might be more mature, make better political decisions in better ways, and perhaps would approach social questions in a better way. He felt specific career orientation might ruin that possibility.

Mr. Cook replied that he saw both sides of the picture and would like to

believe that we do not have to make a hard decision one way or the other. He would place his hopes on much better counseling at the high school level, both in regard to careers and the total meaning of education, and that in the first two or three years of college there would be much better guidance and aptitude testing. If this were done more effectively, a student could not only fit his natural talents to a more reasonable career objective, but he would also have time to explore the various opportunities that would make him a well educated person. He felt that the man who finds a good career will also find more freedom in terms of financial security and thus will have more opportunity to think and read and become the educated person Dean Cooke was describing. Mr. Cook remarked that he would like to accept Dean Cooke's viewpoint without giving up his own.

Dean Bryce Crawford said something about "too many cooks spoiling the broth," but added that Mr. Cook's point that a man's education should have some focus was in no way at odds with Dean Cooke's that a man's education ought not to be too narrowly career oriented.

Asked what he felt the business community ought to be doing differently in reference to higher education or what it was not now accomplishing, Mr. Cook reflected on several matters. He mentioned that it was important that business leaders stay in close touch with the educational world, and he cited his own roles as a member of the Board of Trustees of the Rockefeller University, Tuskegee Institute, and The University of Texas Chancellor's Council and Development Board as examples of how someone from the business community can stay in touch and at the same time offer an opportunity for the educational system to benefit from the perspective of the business world. He felt that increasingly businesses expect to support educational enterprises. He felt that most had programs that encourage continuing adult education and that many in the business community were available for consultation with educators or student leaders. He asserted that he felt much more can and should be done and, in his judgment, will be done.

DR. O. MEREDITH WILSON

There are several reasons why this is an attractive occasion for me. First, I enjoy being with Gordon Whaley. Second, I am a product of the generation in which Stephen Leacock held the place now occupied by the Parkinson and Peter principles, or perhaps Art Buchwald. It is nice to be here in the original shrine. Third, I have lived most of my life in universities and have felt most at home among professors whose problems are not solved. Where could I be more at ease than among graduate deans?

I think that education and society in all of their parts—the high school, the elementary school, the American business community—have the shape they have because they serve or were created by particular kinds of people. There is not as much distance between the motives of people who manage business schools and the people who manage graduate schools, nor is there as much difference in philosophy among them, as one might imagine. These people all emerged from

the same cultural womb, and most of them have been exposed for 16 to 20 years to the same formal character formation and personality-developing instruments or institutions. Thus I would like to talk about what I think the educational system is and how some problems of the graduate schools derive from its nature or from our nature.

Ortega y Gasset, in his book *Toward a Philosophy of History*, returns time and again to a thematic proposition, almost as though it were a fugue in a musical composition. Every lion is in a sense the first lion, but no man born now or in the future can ever again be the first man. The significance of his observation is that every lion, lacking a cultural or intellectual capital from which to draw, lives through almost precisely the same pattern of life that any lion has ever lived through. But a man born as heir to thousands of years of cultural accumulation and as the beneficiary of thousands of years of intellectual exploration and commitment finds himself removed from living the life of the first man.

If we think of man in his first stages, in the first steps toward education, he must have had something that he desperately needed to communicate to somebody. And he must have been living in a social situation wherein that compelling need to communicate forced him, in conjunction with his fellows, to invent language, the capacity for speech. He spoke that first time because he had to share something, or know something, or had to rebuke somebody. The instrument of speech, once devised, became not only a way of expressing feelings and judgments but also the shorthand by which reasoning became possible. There is an American pastoral philosopher who was quoted every time the Americans wanted to justify their unhappiness with Britain—John Wise of Chebacco, who wrote *The Vindication of the Government of the Churches of New England*. One of his propositions went something like this: "Man is the favorite of all animals under heaven because that part of God's image, namely reason, is born in him." It is this capacity to reason that sets man apart from the rest of the animals. The formal machinery he has created in society to magnify this capacity to reason is the school. It is the school that has given society a systematic way of adding generation after generation of schooled people, until we have built an imposing intellectual capital.

As a matter of fact, it is this intellectual capacity, including the technological consequences of it, that has made us a technologically dependent civilization. Man is almost infinitely adaptable. Right now we are having a hard time living with the unexpected consequences of our technology, but we would have a harder time living without its intended blessings. We could not now as a race survive the loss of our technology.

We are now, in an evolutionary sense, much more significantly

formed and forced by the nature of the knowledge that is a part of man than by those bio-genetically determined characteristics that make us look different from the other primates. It is the intellectual capacity, the mind, and the technological consequences that let us fly without wings. The technological consequences of physical chemistry and nuclear physics give us power and light and make us free from the periodicity that enchains other animals, freeing us to see when we will, live where we wish, and exempting us from excessive discomforts of heat and cold. These are the kinds of things that have made us physiologically different or made us physiologically capable of adaptation. We have intellectually managed the environment in which we live.

We started with speech and achieved reason. Ultimately we built the schools that have supported this achievement of tremendous intellectual accumulation. Some of this schooling is organized at an elementary level, some at a secondary. But we have also organized for educating the whole man, giving him a sense of liberal understanding. We educated him so that if he were to be part of the governing elite he could have a fine life and yet be a wise governor and not a cruel one. That required more knowledge or understanding. Hence came the collegiate system, more technology, more sophistication, more specialization. This, in turn, has led us to blow the whole liberalized college into fragments by organizing graduate schools. We now no longer focus on the whole man but on individual idiosyncrasies of particular men with special interests. The fact is that what we want is a systematic philosophy of education. In reality we could go through college and become pragmatic specialists beyond the college without anyone saying much about what the nature of the graduate school is. But I would like to suggest that in all of the education we have developed we have responded to what we at that time assessed to be the need of society. The graduate school is no less an attempt to balance the educational machinery against the social needs than was the liberal arts college. One of the misfortunes is that you have not had a chance to be free from the problem of managing a faculty that does not belong to you, or of managing a community of students that is disparate and hard to get under control. You have not had a chance to be free from those problems long enough to make clear even to yourselves that graduate education is not an excrescence or an intrusion into an otherwise systematic educational community.

The graduate school is a natural consequence of the needs of a society which has become technologically dependent. It is no more wicked to have graduate schools on the campus than it is to have undergraduate schools. As a matter of fact, if you sit in an educational conference and hear someone say in a sort of plaintive, anguished voice that we have got to return to the great classical tradition and recognize

that the chief concern of faculty must be the undergraduate student—well, that's a lot of nonsense. It is perfectly clear that a major intellectual concern of university teachers must be the undergraduate student. But there is equal reason, in a complex civilization, for concern about the teaching of graduate students.

I think it is important for you someday to sit down and think about the philosophical justification of the enterprise of graduate education, and think of it in terms of the nature of the world in which you live. Society could not survive, I think you would agree with me, in a world without either Ph.D.'s or people with the equivalent capacity to manage technology.

Either we should say society has got itself into such a complex sophisticated situation that it is not viable and should be allowed to die, or we should systematically prepare society to create a viable cultural whole through a sort of division of intellectual labor. Such division of labor would be understandable to Adam Smith, for by better and more sophisticated means of dividing problems we can make out of the world we have inherited an even better world.

You can say that the graduate education enterprise is the natural consequence of the intellectual evolution of Western man. If it is disorderly, it is because we have been kept too busy to give it order, and not because, being new and disorderly, it is therefore bad. Graduate deans and university presidents have within their grasp something good and significant, the graduate school. But it has been a little too complex and a little too elaborate for us to understand and characterize for ourselves and others. It is now time to get a good purchase on it.

Graduate and undergraduate students are both there, and both are needed. The resolution of the problem of graduate education is not likely to yield to enquiry that begins with a proposition that the real obligation of the university is to the undergraduate student. It is likely to yield to the proposition that the obligation of a university is to provide the educational machinery that responds to the total educational needs of society.

I am prepared to say that there are a lot of expressed needs of society that are not real needs, and I am prepared to say that there is a lot of confusion. In universities and graduate schools there is always confusion. In higher education we need to recognize that, to use a geological metaphor, we built a stratum of elementary education and we firmed it up. We built a stratum of liberal arts education and we firmed it up. Now we have laid down a delta on those strata that is not solid yet. That delta is graduate education, and it offers just as much to the new generation as did its predecessors.

The whole system of education is necessary to balance the modern needs of society. It will be useful to the extent you find a way to en-

compass the whole system, including the graduate school, in your affection and in your attention.

DISCUSSION

Mr. C. W. Cook asked: "Towards the end when you said that baccalaureate education has been 'firmed up,' would you go quite that far? I have the feeling that that part is still somewhere in ferment and not quite as solid as your term might imply."

Dr. Wilson replied: "I don't know whether you want to use the word *ferment* or not. I don't see anything wrong with ferment in undergraduate education. By *firmed up* I meant we really know that it belongs. There may be a lot of things about it that make us restless. The restlessness of this generation is not without cause. I see the current restlessness actually as part of firming up the educational institution.

"A lot of people are blaming the failures of undergraduate education on parents. People have become so independent of the home that the home looks like it could be left out for awhile. All over the country some people have said, well, let's turn child-rearing over to the schools. Our schools did so well every time a new problem came up we tend to say give the problem to the school or to the university, whereas there are a lot of those problems that ought to have been solved elsewhere."

Dean Daniel Alpert remarked: "I am delighted with your comments about the need for a philosophical rationale for graduate education. It seems to me that our society is making demands that go beyond elementary and secondary levels and what we have been doing in graduate schools does not begin to be sufficient to deal with the technological society that we have created. In my own institution we have 81 graduate departments. We have learned to deal with 81 pieces of a problem, but we have yet to cope with a new graduate education that looks at the whole problem or at least a significant portion of it."

Dr. Wilson then commented: "It is true that the purpose of business is business or the economic well-being of the people who are dependent on business. Up until now each business has been justified in assuming that its operations were self-contained and separate and that the social costs were not necessarily a part of the business costs. Now if somebody like Boeing builds an SST and you only compute as the cost of the SST its planning, physical construction, testing, and the airports to accommodate it, and you do not consider as cost the effects of the boom on all of the people it passes over, you may tempt technology to produce, by its independent action, elements that are indigestible in the total culture. We have a new problem of coordinating the products of technology because now there are so many of us and so much of it that the effects are interlocking. You need to recognize the fact that there have always been social costs, but we have ignored them because we felt we could afford to. Now part of the cost of the internal combustion engine to be considered hereafter must include its effects upon the atmosphere around us. Every power plant has to consider now as a part of its production the effects of sulphur or phosphates that are released into the air. I think Dean Boddy was referring to these tertiary costs that may not be part of what is ordinarily thought of as the productivity of the industry.

"Society has changed in part the cost of each instrument. Understanding

the tertiary costs of preparing students for each profession may become a new major concern of graduate deans. I don't think you will be getting an understanding of what happens in the tertiary regions by over-reaching educational developments. You will get it by having some people who will concern themselves with the philosophical consequences of the technological society. We may discover that the university itself may have tertiary uncalculated costs in producing our philosophical professionals."

DEAN GEORGE WINCHESTER STONE, JR.

We are all familiar with the fact (if I may use a military analogy) that there are three levels of strategy. One is grand strategy which has to do with political and economic situations; a second is the strategic planning of a campaign to execute a maneuver with success; and the third one involves tactics on the firing line.

We as graduate deans have to operate on all three of these levels. We have to plan, to maneuver, and are right now on the firing line. That is why we are concerned with teaching assistants and their compensation and other pertinent housekeeping problems.

By way of quick review let me mention that within our lifetime the whole concept of the college and of graduate school has shown a threefold shift. Most of us here, I expect, were brought up with the idea that libraries, colleges, and graduate schools, in general, have had to do with the development of an appreciative scholarship and an extended understanding of the magnificent heritage that we as individuals have fallen heir to, as Meredith Wilson was suggesting.

About 1935, I guess it was, Robert Hutchins suggested that colleges and universities and a growing society could no longer afford the luxury of that particular point of view, but that universities should operate as service stations in life, expanding and developing and contracting according to social needs. So we moved out from the earlier aim of colleges and have moved and expanded as service stations for life.

In the 1960's the first and second ideas suffered a third change to the idea that the university must be the gadfly to the government, the gadfly to the public, the gadfly to society. A gadfly to do what?—to end pollution, to end poverty, to stop wars, and now to bring tentative processes into a kind of reality. We are right now dealing with this particular sort of thing, although we have also inherited the other points of view. Well, here we are, and most of us know that these things run in cycles. In the midst of a new fluctuation we are called to shift our practices and purposes in order to alleviate a present situation, or to initiate new directions which would be more meaningful to ourselves, to students, and to life in the world we live in.

In this room, of course, we are all graduate deans and that's about

the only thing that unites us. We are not a monolithic or unified group otherwise. My racket (abiding love I should say) is the London stage in the eighteenth century—it's a great period. All of us have our different points of view, our different backgrounds. Dean Alpert is a great physicist, Dean Baker is a chemist, and present are so many chemistry deans you can almost smell the tear gas. The economists here are very heavily represented. We also, however, are concerned with what we call graduate education and the advancement, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge, in the appreciation of our heritage from the past.

One may reiterate the four purposes of graduate education: preservation, advancement, and dissemination of knowledge, and the production of the self-sustaining scholar. Of course, we have to produce a man who can carry on himself without being spoon-fed or wet-nursed by the professors for a longer period.

The development of the independent scholar, one might say, of the self-sustaining scholar, is basically what education is all about. But the richness of life depends upon having many options. We have to keep many options open; it would be absurd for us to try to develop a kind of monolithic approach to this business whereby this field or that field or this approach or that approach is sacrosanct.

At the present time we are criticized mainly for our overspecialization, and a consequent lack of relevance to contemporary society, but we remember, of course, that specialization is nothing new. In the Middle Ages it took 14 craft guilds to build a saddle. There were nailers and leather makers and carpenters, etc., and they were all specialists. This is the nature of man's interests. Francis Bacon might have taken *all* knowledge for his province and he was damned good. Each of us has, no doubt, some broad philosophical point of view, and we fit ourselves into this pattern. But all of us like to know something more than the next man in a particular field. Obviously if we get into too small specialties, we become easy targets of attack. But by specialization we combat bigness and bigness is one of our plagues. Speed is another. We recognize the need for a lot of revision in order to work the specialties into a wider, richer framework.

Relevance, however, it seems to me, is a matter of the *learning* process and not of the *teaching* process. The minute we make relevance, except in the professional and the vocational schools, the focus of teaching, we turn down relevance as part of the learning process that it is. The basic problem of the student is to find relevance in whatever subject matter he pursues and not to accept prefabricated instructions about it from his professors.

The basic criticism we are getting now is the criticism that Horace got about beauty, that is to say, the usefulness versus the beauty of

learning. The same long argument occurs in a medieval poem, "The Owl and the Nightingale." The nightingale suggests one kind of usefulness, and the owl suggests another sort.

Now the most interesting commenter on this subject, it seems to me, is Samuel Daniel. His *Musophilus* is a great poem. Musophilus loves knowledge and the muses, and debates with Philocosmus, who loves the world. He comes up with a saying, "While timorous knowledge stands considering, audacious ignorance hath done the deed." Many such practical statements animate the poem. It is the sort of thing against which Musophilus had to argue—the beauty of the preservation of a great tradition and that sort of thing.

In the arts and sciences the time has obviously come, I think, for expansion and for inclusion, but not particularly for a radical shift to vocationalism and to paths leading to immediate relevance. I have taught in urban universities all my life, and it seems to me that there is much to be said for a new emphasis on urban *values* as opposed to problems. I'm surfeited with problem-oriented approaches. We'll always have them. But values—what is the *value* of our urban civilization? One of the values is freedom, but the price we pay for it is apt to be facelessness. We are absolutely free in a great urban center, as we are not in a small town. How do we meet the consequences of this freedom? What about the values of the institutions that a great urban center offers? How can we begin to suggest the *values* of this? We can begin to emphasize and study and analyze the value systems in our particular school or the community in which we live. We need new strategies and new tactics if we are going to expand the framework of graduate education and make it more inclusive. But innovation with present departmental structures is difficult. A department of English with its tenured members has certain standards, and the members tend to recruit new people that have those standards. Thus one gets a kind of encapsulated repetition of his own image, and I suppose the only thing we can do is gradually to widen into disciplinary or multidisciplinary programs with various optional approaches.

At NYU the most radical thoughts are being expressed by those students coming from the professional schools, the business, law, and medical schools. They are dissatisfied. So we now have a new degree, requested by the medical students, called the M.D.-Ph.D. in the Social Sciences, whereby a few medical students (and not in a great rush) are going to move into the field of the social sciences. They will have to live up to the prescribed requirements both of medicine and of the social sciences, and are willing to do so in the belief that the doctor can no longer be only the expert physician or medicine man. He has to have a wider ability and a wider vision. The business people are doing the same sort of thing. This seems positive and useful, and it

will gradually develop, it seems to me, some useful interdisciplinary groups, and these groups by their very existence will change values and create new images and types of scholars.

If you damn the admissions system, the lecture system, and the grading system, you are attacking the problem of externals, though they are visible to the student of the present time. We are not going to get any real change unless the professional schools blend interests with ours and unless students are convinced that we are constantly re-assessing what we're doing on our own. In that way lies our hope.

I shall end with a story which may be familiar to you. I think those of us in this room are like that man who bought a horse. He wanted a very lively horse. He found one and the man who sold it to him told him that this was the most spirited horse that he would ever find, so the buyer mounted and asked how to move the horse to action. The man who sold it said that the horse was very religious and the only way to make him go was to say "Thank God," and the only way to stop him was to say "Amen." So the rider said "Thank God" and went off. When he got going at a good clip he saw he was approaching a 2,000 foot precipice and said to himself, "I don't know how to stop this horse, I've forgotten." So he prayed the Lord's Prayer and when he came to the end said "Amen," and the horse stopped right at the edge of the cliff. The man was so relieved that he said, "Oh, Thank God."

That is the position we are in at the moment.

DISCUSSION

Summarizing, Dean W. Gordon Whaley said that it seemed clear to him that the main functions for the graduate schools had come out of these definitions of philosophy of purpose which included a clear-cut description of where the technological focus of training may take an individual. All through this is a return to respect for what has been referred to here as the human condition and the satisfaction of human needs, he felt. "It seems to me that a key purpose which encompasses all of these matters is attention to a reestablishment of the dialog. I would like to point out that difficult as that problem is at the present time with the pressure of numbers, unless we can reestablish the dialog and improve communication, we are not going to get there and that is the one focus I would personally put before you."

REPORT ON LUNCHEON DISCUSSIONS

[At luncheon on 22 October the delegates distributed themselves for roundtable discussions of the following topics: The Doctor of Arts degree (two tables), post-baccalaureate education, minority group students, student financial aid and Federal support (two tables), employment of Ph.D.'s, and teaching assistants. The spokesmen for the various tables reported as follows.—ED.]

DEAN IRWIN W. SIZER

THERE was general agreement that more options for graduate education are needed in addition to the conventional Ph.D. degree, but there was also some doubt whether alternative opportunities could provide the same degree of scholarly competency as actual engagement in research.

The question about the respectability of the D.A., which has come up all the time, was raised again. Would a hiring institution consider the D.A. equal, or inferior, to the Ph.D.? On the other hand, some institutions, disenchanted with the demands of the Ph.D., might be more inclined to accept someone with a different kind of training.

I am not sure of any consensus at the table, but I do think, if I could interpret the various comments, that there was support of an alternative kind of experience at the graduate level, along with some uncertainty whether a new degree like the D.A. would be generally well received.

DEAN E. P. BOLLIER

I think that Dean Rocek of the University of Illinois made a rather interesting suggestion. It is the possibility, at least for the sciences, although I am not sure he intended to limit it to the sciences, that a D.A., or something equivalent to it, might very well be a post-Ph.D. degree—that it might serve to designate a formalization of postdoctoral work directed towards teaching in contrast to the usual kind of postdoctoral work directed towards research. That suggestion was made fairly late in our discussion, and so I cannot say that we arrived at any consensus about it.

The matter which occupied most of our time grew out of a proposed Doctor of Arts degree at Illinois Chicago Circle—a degree which, as I understand it, would be essentially the same as that subscribed to by the CGS except that part of the program would be intensive training in “direct educational technology,” which means the use of audio-

visual aids, computers, etc. This information led us off into a number of divergent and very interesting but in some respects irrelevant topics.

DEAN FRANCIS M. BODDY

We did not talk about the very broad range that might be included in the idea of post-baccalaureate education, but principally about the way in which the current kind of post-baccalaureate education in the graduate schools might itself be modified or adapted to present needs.

It was agreed that there is a very great need of applied training for the practitioner as contrasted with more scholarly training. There seems to be, among our clients, some disillusion with the usefulness of the present kind of Ph.D. research training. We also discussed the up-dating of professional training and whether or not this requires a degree. Another degree at this point seemed to be a matter of no particular importance to the group at the table, although I think we all agreed that it might have a great importance to the people who wish to take such training.

One thing that came out of the discussions is that graduate schools are not really well adapted to this kind of modification in the typical graduate program and are perhaps even less adaptable to serving the kind of clientele that is not now involved in graduate programs.

I guess we all have the feeling that society imposes a very large demand for problem solving and thinks that universities with their expertise ought to be able to help. Perhaps there is a need for more programs involving urban affairs centers, medical centers providing new kinds of medical care, and things of this sort.

DEAN HARRY G. YAMAGUCHI

My overall feeling is that some of the meaty questions we got into are questions that require a great deal of thoughtful deliberation in addition to some experience in order to get some inkling of the validity of our ideas.

For example, one of the first ideas discussed was that probably the long-range method of reducing the problems of disadvantaged students is to encourage the old system whereby scholars would return to their former communities and schools. One can debate the pros and cons of this system, but it would in the long run elevate the undergraduate training of our prospective graduate students.

One fairly specific issue we discussed arises when an applicant says, "I am a disadvantaged Black undergraduate and therefore would like a waiver of the application fee." On this particular problem, we found divergent views represented at our table. At two institutions, apparently there is no problem; the application fee is being waived. At another

institution, the application fee is waived until the person is accepted, and then there is a fee. The idea which emerged from our discussion is that on this issue one should be democratic in a very broad sense. To most of us the factor of need is a fairly respectable basis to make distinctions on, even though to do so is discriminating. It does have the flavor of acceptableness in a democracy. And therefore Black or White, if the person making a plea for a fee waiver can indicate need, perhaps that's one way of handling it.

We found quite a bit of difference among the institutions represented on the matter of types of inducements used in recruitment. For example, at one institution, fellowships have been set up from university funds specifically for Blacks. And these stipends are sizable and larger than average, as I recall. I think those of us from state institutions feel that this kind of fellowship plan is way down the road and have preferred a departmental operation, whereby departments embark on recruiting programs within their own disciplines. Furthermore, departments can set aside assistantships for students who possibly would not be accepted and awarded assistantships if they were not Black. These students are then brought in basically on the Woodrow Wilson Disadvantaged Students fellowship pattern for two years of guaranteed support with one year for catch-up.

At the very end of our discussion we got into a very important issue: the gains and losses involved in deliberately looking for Black faculty and administrators. As far as gains are concerned there is obviously the tremendous improvement an institution achieves by having Black faculty and not just Black students. On the other hand some concern was expressed over the loss that Black faculty and indeed graduate students incur when they are the forerunners of a change from a low representation of Blacks on a campus to a higher one. But, to summarize, we agreed that it is undoubtedly worth the effort to recruit Black faculty, although it is a high-risk enterprise for the people involved, particularly the Blacks.

DEAN ROBERT H. BAKER

We, at our table, deliberated on our obligations to society and wondered whether we would serve it better by struggling harder to keep up the present level of doctoral study or whether, indeed, we should accommodate ourselves to the apparent wishes of the Congress and the people at large by reducing the number of doctorates our universities are capable of producing. There was no consensus, but there were those who expressed the opinion that it did not matter much because we would not have the means to go on as usual. Neither the institutions themselves nor the institutions with Foundation help

could possibly meet the deficiencies in financing doctoral education that have come upon us. We were also confused about the proper goals and saw little danger of there being an over-supply of doctorates by 1980. The growth of 12% per year that has been our practice would easily reach 50,000 per year, but the growth we will make will certainly fall far short of that. We did have the feeling that our current difficulties of apparent over-supply of doctoral students is due to under-employment of them in both industry and in the academic community. We noted that the laying off of recently trained doctorates both in the universities and in industry is adding to the difficulty of employment of the on-coming doctoral classes.

One point to which there was agreement was that if a few years hence we find we are under-shooting the goal of need for new doctorates, it would be impossible in less than five years to correct the trend regardless of how much money was devoted to the enterprise. We could not, for example, change from a level of 30,000 in 1975 to 50,000 in 1980 by any means known to higher education.

Several of us have noted significant declines in the first year enrollment of doctoral students in our universities. This is far more significant than the total registrations, because those who did not begin this year will not be second year and third year students later. The first year class is the most sensitive to the amount of financial aid available.

DEAN MARTIN CHUSID

After a few delightful moments of acting as if we were at a no-problems table, we turned to the topic of discussion. A few persons lamented the decline of Federal support. It was noted that this decline caused some private universities to supplement the government programs, thereby diverting support from other worthy programs.

There was a discussion of the philosophy and objectives behind the National Science Foundation policy decisions, with some censuring of the Office of the Budget. Money simply has not been forthcoming fast enough for the National Science Foundation to provide adequate guidelines. There was agreement that Federal support must be constant over a period of years so that we can actually do some long range planning.

A statement was made, possibly an assumption, that with respect to NDSL loans graduate students are being shortchanged. This led to the principal topic of discussion, namely the value in packaging loans and other means of support to graduate students.

We discussed for a while the ETS plan of making parents' income the determining factor for loans to graduate students. There was a

resounding *no* to Dr. Winterbottom of ETS, who was sitting at our table. Although the value for such a plan was granted in the case of students who attended professional schools, it was felt that graduate students needed to be more mature and therefore that they should not automatically be dependent on parental support.

The general feeling—and here we agree with Dean Yamaguchi—was that all graduate students are needy. In fact very few graduate students have independent incomes, and once the parent ceases his support, the graduate student becomes a member of a needy class. Therefore the awards and loans have to be made on a merit basis recognizing that there is still another disadvantaged class.

Several specific plans were discussed. One of them was a long-term, low-interest loan, perhaps for a period of twenty-five years, guaranteed by the government, and in some instances with a forgiveness clause.

Another plan packaged fellowship support and loans. It was suggested that during the first year there be heavy fellowship support. During the second and third year the student might function as a teaching assistant, and during the last or dissertation year perhaps there could be twenty-five per cent support coupled with a seventy-five per cent loan. The details of such a plan are, of course, negotiable.

The advantages of loans were discussed (e.g., students who take them really make a commitment). It was further felt that the students' motivation would be tested, particularly if the loan were made for the dissertation year. The student would be encouraged to finish sooner so that he would not have to keep borrowing. Furthermore, the feeling that universities should wait a year before appointing their teaching assistants had support. Obviously the adequacy of the students may be better judged if the students have been in the department for a while.

The final plan discussed was attributed to Princeton. Students are placed in three categories as they enter the university: one group is granted a full stipend, another is granted a half stipend and half loan, and the third group are all on loan. The placement is made on the basis of past merit and future prospects.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Over a period of perhaps twenty years, Dr. Lloyd G. Humphreys pointed out, the number of Ph.D.'s produced in disciplines with very little support has increased at about the same rate as those in disciplines with a great deal of support. He also raised the question whether the quality of the product in the second group has been any higher than in the first. Dean George K. Fraenkel asked what, if this is the case, the National Science Board hopes to accomplish by setting up categorical training grants. Two things, Dr. Humphreys replied: first, to contribute to the total support

available for graduate students and, secondly, to help graduate schools move into socially desirable directions of graduate training.

Referring to the increase of Ph.D.'s in both supported and non-supported disciplines, Dean Robert H. Baker pointed out that Federal support of certain fields allows a university to divert more of its funds to the support of other fields. This diversion has enabled more students to enter the humanities, for instance, than would have been consigned there by Federal agencies.

Dean W. Donald Cooke added that, because of this diversion of university funds, the humanities students are the best supported students at Cornell; that is, although essentially all Ph.D. candidates are supported, the students in the humanities have a higher ratio of years of fellowship support compared to years of service appointments.

DEAN ROY S. ANDERSON

The six individuals at our table reported approximately a five to twenty per cent reduction this year in incoming graduate students at their respective institutions. They agreed that there has been a decline in all areas of employment opportunity for new Ph.D.'s and, as a corollary to that, that we are now faced with a situation which is different from what we have had for at least the past decade: A degree recipient is no longer guaranteed employment, either in the area or at the level for which he has been trained. I am sure these conclusions come as no surprise to any of us.

The group expressed a concern about a possible over-reaction to the situation, in particular that we are purposely cutting back on our graduate enrollments.

Secondly, the group expressed a need for the departments, not the deans, to communicate to incoming students the situation with respect to employment opportunities.

The next point was the one we have all heard about here this morning, namely, that there is a need for planning at the national level. Questions were raised such as: Where are the specially trained people needed? What are the problems that must be solved that require manpower? We heard this morning that the National Science Foundation and the National Science Board have at least considered the sciences, but there is a need for a greater exploration of these problems on a broad national level, hopefully to co-ordinate all such planning.

The group agreed that there was an absence of reliable data, an absence of interpretations, and certainly an absence of predictions.

Finally, the group noted, with concern, the uncertain market for holders of any kind of graduate degrees. We have just heard about two tables that discussed the need for a Doctor of Arts degree or, let us say, some other kind of doctoral degree. Employment possibilities for these people are very certainly as indefinite as they are for Ph.D.'s. On this

point the table merely suggests that there is a need for a cautious approach to the establishment of any new doctoral program.

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Dean S. D. S. Spragg reported that he has used the National Research Council questionnaire, in non-science as well as science departments, to obtain data on the employment of recent doctorates. He has supplemented the questionnaire by asking the departments also to indicate the institution and the appointment received. Fewer than two per cent of the 1969 Rochester doctoral graduates were reported to be unemployed, and the data that has just come back for the class of 1970 still indicates under two per cent unemployment. This procedure for gathering such data is a relatively easy one. Dean Crawford reported the same procedure at Minnesota and agreed that this is a matter in which department chairmen have a strong interest and are therefore motivated to assist.

DEAN NORMAN H. CROMWELL

I might mention two or three things regarding teaching assistants. Somebody asked whether there was a real difference in the time that is required for a man to complete the degree when he is supported as compared with those who are not supported. In general the answer was, "Well, not really." Of course, when we got down to cases, it turns out that if you talk about chemists, physicists, etc., the time required for both groups is often the same. We have not had much data in the past with regard to supported people in the humanities and social sciences. So we are not sure that our answers would be the same in these areas. It is of course obvious that the general average time for the Ph.D. has been longer for students in the social sciences and the humanities.

Then somebody brought up the question of income tax waiver for teaching assistants around the country, and I pointed out that several years ago I got involved in trying to help fight this battle on a national scale and was told to forget it—that the only way you could solve these problems is with your own individual Commissioner of Internal Revenue. There are some states, including my own, in which the commissioner can be sold on this idea for three years; that is, you can make a case for three years of waiver of taxation on teaching assistants' stipends (up to \$3,600 per year), and this is true apparently in other states.

We found it difficult to discuss in a meaningful way the costs involved in using teaching assistants for undergraduate instruction.

Someone pointed out that the overall requirements for certain undergraduate programs are in general being removed and that this may reduce the need for as many teaching assistants as we have had to have in the past. The service loads may drop. About seven out of nine

of the people at the table reported that graduate student unions were being organized on their campuses, but I was not sure from this response whether they meant unions or graduate students associations, which of course are quite different.

This brought up the question of who has the right to vote in these unions or associations. Will all graduate students vote? Obviously when you are talking about a union, you are talking about members who are employed and paid some kind of wage; otherwise the association is not going to be negotiating for something that I suppose unions ordinarily negotiate for. Dean McCarthy has already pointed out the necessity of having some way to find out what teaching assistants are paid—the real take-home pay. If the AAUP survey will do something about this, fine, but if it doesn't answer the question, then I expect our group would say that we need to attack this problem, difficult as it is.

Another question was how long teaching assistants should expect to be supported. There seemed to be a consensus that they ought, if they are making satisfactory progress toward their degrees, to be supported for, say, three years as a teaching assistant. But this then immediately opened up the question of what is to be considered as satisfactory progress toward a degree. And it was admitted that each department has to define that—that you cannot generalize from one area to the next.

The group also discussed the legal actions currently being taken by students who, having failed the comprehensive examination, have brought suit to obtain their degrees on the basis of satisfactory grades. We didn't really see how the court could rule that the university had to grant the degree, although possibly it might require a second examination by a different committee. It was hoped that the graduate dean would at least have this option.

We also discussed the qualifications and duties of teaching assistants. It is obvious that teaching assistants do different things for different people. In other words, some people refer to teaching assistants as those who are actually administratively responsible for courses, giving the lectures and totally administering sections, whereas other assistants only teach quiz sections and labs. These distinctions must be considered as we look into so-called rights and responsibilities of teaching assistants.

Finally, it was suggested that some of these problems might be eased by hiring full-time employees to run quiz sections and labs. This of course would remove a principal source of graduate student support.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

[The report of the Committee on Communications with the Public was given in the General Session on 21 October, with Dr. Arnstein, Mr. Cornell, and Dean Spriestersbach participating. See pp. 20-31 above. The remaining reports were presented at the Business Session on 22 October.—Ed.]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TESTING

THE purpose of the Committee is to provide liaison between the AGS and the GRE Board which formulates policy and supervises its execution with respect to the Graduate Record Examinations and the Graduate School Foreign Language Tests. Each year the AGS appoints one new member to the GRE Board who serves for a term of four years. The four AGS appointees who are currently members of the GRE Board together with a representative of the program direction staff of the Educational Testing Service constitute the membership of the AGS Committee on Testing. The Board met on two occasions during the past year to review the operational aspects of testing programs, to receive reports on various projects, completed and continuing, to consider proposals for new projects, and to review the financial status of the program.

The year 1969-70 was a year of major decisions in the GRE program and a year during which the groundwork was laid for major developments which will extend well into the foreseeable future. Over the past two years a plan has been in preparation for a fundamental restructuring of the tests offered in the program and, during 1969-70, the GRE Board made a final decision to invest the substantial sums of money necessary to carry the plan through to completion by 1974. In an area of great social significance, the program has undertaken a number of actions aimed at defining and mitigating the problems emerging from the testing of members of minority and disadvantaged students. During the year, significant strides were made toward the completion of a major project designed to accumulate, analyze, and interpret comprehensive data on policies and practices in the areas of graduate school admissions and fellowship awards.

These developments are discussed briefly in the balance of this report, along with a number of other matters which have concerned the Board over the past year.

Restructuring of the Test Offerings

The GRE Board has been aware that the tests offered through the program have remained relatively static while graduate education has been undergoing far-reaching changes. A year and a half ago it directed its staff at ETS to prepare a plan for the complete restructuring of the testing program. Such a plan was developed and, after extensive review within ETS, by the examination committees, and by the GRE Board, it was formally presented to the Board at its meeting in March 1970. The Board accepted it and authorized the expenditure of the necessary funds to carry it through to completion by 1974.

With regard to the Advanced Tests, the mode of administration will be modified in such a way as to permit the examination committees greater flexibility in designing the tests for which they are responsible. They will be given the opportunity to experiment more freely with new ideas in testing and it will be possible, if they wish, to redesign tests in such a way as to produce a more analytical description of the candidate's performance through the use of subscores. During the coming academic year, the examination committees will be encouraged to hold deliberative sessions, as opposed to sessions devoted directly to the production of additional forms of the tests, during which they will seek to redesign their tests in the light of their analyses of the nature and needs of the disciplines they represent. Revisions will be worked into each of the Advanced Tests on a schedule adapted to the problems peculiar to the field it represents and to the nature of the changes called for.

The Aptitude Test will be redesigned in such a way as to retain the traditional scores reflecting verbal and quantitative abilities but to obtain these scores in a shorter time. The time so made available will be used for a variety of relatively specialized aptitude and background materials to be selected by the candidate in accordance with the discipline he plans to enter. Thus, for example, a candidate intending Mathematics, Engineering, or Physics might be required to take a test in mathematics which is more demanding than the Quantitative Aptitude Test taken by all candidates. A candidate planning to study English might take a test measuring his familiarity with major intellectual movements with which anyone intending to pursue one of the humanistic disciplines needs some acquaintance. The determination of which aptitude and background materials will be developed and which will be suggested for a given discipline will be made in consultation with the examination committees for the Advanced Tests.

Preparations for redesigning the Aptitude Test, both in conception and content, have reached the stage where materials illustrating some

of the kinds of testing that might be considered are being prepared at ETS to assist the examination committees in their deliberations on this matter during the coming fall and spring.

Changes in Test Offerings

In September 1968, the GRE Board authorized the preparation and introduction of an Advanced Test in German. Developmental work has been completed and the test will be offered beginning in October 1970.

During the past academic year, a question arose within the examination committee for the recently introduced Anthropology Test as to whether the test was appropriate to the field it purported to represent or, indeed, whether an appropriate test could be developed given the heterogeneity of the field and the constraints which are necessarily present in a mass testing program based on multiple-choice techniques. During the spring and after consideration of the matter by the GRE Board at its March meeting, a survey was addressed to chairmen of anthropology departments to obtain their reactions to the present test and their opinion as to the feasibility of producing a useful test. The GRE Board will consider the results of the survey at their September meeting and will make a decision regarding retention of the test.

Minority Groups

The GRE Board has shared with graduate education as a whole a concern about the under-representation of Black students and other minority group students in graduate schools. The Board's concern is focused particularly on the effect which the use of test scores may have on the accessibility of graduate education to minority groups. A number of approaches are being taken with the dual purpose of defining the problem more clearly and of taking immediate steps to alleviate it. Among the actions so far completed or under way are the following:

- a) Members of the ETS staff have visited the campuses of predominantly Black graduate schools to discuss with the faculties and administrative staffs the nature of the problem and possible solutions.
- b) During the past summer, three Black consultants have been invited to spend several days with ETS staff members reviewing the tests, reacting to proposals which are under consideration, and offering suggestions for action. Arrangements are being made for similar visits with Chicano consultants.
- c) The GRE Board directed the ETS staff to cooperate with CGS in the development, distribution, and analysis of a questionnaire to graduate schools designed to obtain comprehensive informa-

tion about special programs for minority groups now in operation or contemplated.

- d) A deliberate though only partially successful effort has been made to recruit Black faculty members to the examination committees for the Advanced Tests. During their deliberations regarding the redesign of the Advanced Tests, the examination committees will be asked to deal specifically with the question of minimizing test bias.
- e) The Board's Research Committee plans to include in its program for the coming year several research projects which will utilize statistical methods and the informed judgment of experts to examine questions regarding the nature and extent of bias in the tests.

Study of Graduate Admissions and Fellowship Selection Policies and Procedures

During the past year, an intensive effort has been under way to gather comprehensive information about policies governing graduate admissions decisions and fellowship awards and about the practices through which these policies are put into effect. It is the GRE Board's belief that the project will be beneficial in two ways: first, it will make it possible for schools to study their own policies and procedures in these areas in the light of a large body of relevant data regarding what goes on in other schools; second, it will make it possible to achieve better integration of GRE tests and services with the activities of graduate school admissions offices.

In executing this project, an extensive questionnaire regarding admissions and fellowship selection was developed and distributed to the graduate schools. The results were analyzed and a report has been released to the schools. In addition, three-day visits have been paid to the campuses of six schools for the purpose of studying more intensively the policies and practices of a number of representative schools. The results of these visits have also been written up in report form.

During the coming year, plans call for holding six conferences at which problems in these areas will be discussed and the implications of the questionnaire results and of the case studies will be explored by representatives from the graduate schools. It is expected that a final summary publication based on the conferences will round off the project.

Research

At its meeting in September 1969, the Board adopted as a statement of its future research interests a paper by Dr. Winton H. Manning of

the ETS staff entitled *The Research Program of the Graduate Record Examinations Board: A Framework for Planning for the 1970's*. By providing a comprehensive view of the areas of research which are proper to the Board's concern, it provides a basis for establishing research priorities, for inviting research proposals, and for evaluating proposals which come before it. The document has been published and has been widely distributed among graduate schools.

Among the more important pieces of research which are either under way or have been approved and funded by the Board are the following:

- a) A study being conducted collaboratively with the Office of Scientific Personnel of the NRC to use the doctoral file in an effort to determine whether time to degree can be predicted by test scores and certain types of background data.
- b) A project investigating the feasibility of using biographical data as moderator variables, that is as factors for identifying groups of applicants for which the conventional predictors of academic performance (e.g., scores and grades) should be used in special ways.
- c) An exploratory study to determine whether a systematic means can be devised for collecting from faculty additional evaluations of students which can be used to supplement grades.
- d) A project to test out a theoretical statistical model which is intended to maximize the accuracy of predicting academic performance when data are quantitatively and qualitatively limited.
- e) A study of the relationship of the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL), GRE scores, and graduate school grades for foreign students.

Graduate School Foreign Language Tests

The downward trend in number of candidates taking the tests, first observed last year, continued during 1969-70 with a decline from 31,000 (1968-69) to 26,000 (1969-70). The major reason for the decline is probably the reduction in foreign language requirements resulting from a continued swing to departmental option. The situation is somewhat clouded, however, by the inauguration during the past year of a national rather than an institutional method of administration, which may have had an adverse effect on candidate volume.

In the past, score reporting in the GSFLT program has required a period of three to five weeks from the date of test administration. By means of streamlining the scoring and reporting procedures, the anticipated score reporting schedule has been reduced so that scores will be released between two and four weeks after the test date.

A major difficulty in predicting the future of the program has been uncertainty as to the extent to which the foreign language requirement will be maintained as a doctoral prerequisite. Departments and graduate schools are, in turn, hampered in deciding policy on this matter by the absence of solid data on the extent to which foreign language proficiency is necessary or useful in graduate study and professional life. To provide some information on this question, the Board authorized a survey to be directed at a sample of Ph.D. recipients who received their degrees over the past ten years. The names of 24,000 degree recipients have been obtained from the doctoral file maintained by the National Research Council, a questionnaire has been developed, and it will be sent out in mid-October.

H. FREDERIC BOHNENBLUST
MICHAEL J. BRENNAN
BRYCE CRAWFORD, JR.
JOSEPH L. MCCARTHY
JOHN A. WINTERBOTTOM, *Chairman*

[*The report of the Committee on Testing was accepted.*]

REPORT OF THE MEMBERSHIP COMMITTEE

Dean Crawford reported for Dean McCarthy and Dean Baker that the Membership Committee has been in consultation with the AAU members of the Committee and understands that there will be no changes in membership coming up in the immediate future.

[The report of the Membership Committee was accepted.]

REPORT OF THE
ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS
AND COUNCIL OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

Your committee invites your attention to the reports of previous committees with the same title and circulated prior to the 1968 and 1969 fall meetings, respectively. In these reports, the scope of interest was declared to include among other items, a) foreign students here, b) American students abroad, c) exchanges of scholars, d) technical and professional assistance in the development of education and technology abroad, and e) efforts to increase the knowledge and understanding of Americans with respect to the rest of the world. The specific items mentioned included a) admissions problems, including especially evaluation of credentials, b) financial problems, especially for foreign students here or coming here, c) experiences, attitudes, and contributions, here and in their own countries, of foreign students both immediately after and some years after the completion of their programs of study, and d) public policy of the United States. Also mentioned were the 26 April 1968, and 29 April 1969 issues of the *Bulletin on International Education*, published by the American Council on Education, in the latter of which appears the statement, "Two issues profoundly affect the future of international education at present: *solvency* and *purpose*."

We also refer you to the report of the Wingspread Conference held on 16, 17 June 1970 at Racine, which states that each institution is obliged to develop an "explicit rationale for the admission and training of foreign students" and be prepared to promulgate and defend that rationale before its funding authorities and agencies.

Previous committees recommended in their reports that "several definitive research studies [be made] with respect to foreign graduate students who come to American universities: the predictors of successful and unsuccessful performance in graduate work; the performance of foreign students in American graduate schools as compared with American students in the same programs; comparisons of the characteristics of foreign students who return to their home countries as against those who do not; the difference being a foreign student in the United States makes to a graduate student after he returns and picks up his career and personal life [in his home country]; etc."

It is against the backdrop of these reports and other materials as well as of the responses of the AGS to them that your committee formulates and submits this report.

- 1) The need for the definitive studies mentioned has increased markedly. It seems certain that of all the foreign students who apply for admission to American graduate schools, the *percentage* who can be admitted will decrease. This probably means that more selectivity will have to be used. If such selectivity is to have an optimum effect, its components of randomness will have to be eliminated or at worst reduced as far as may be possible. Thus the admissions aspects of the definitive studies is clearly and urgently required.

The urgency of the need for the valid and useful results of such studies is almost certainly more acute in institutions with lesser (even if growing) numbers of graduate students than among the members of AGS. Their administrative staffs are certain to be less extensive both in numbers and in experience, in evaluating the credentials of foreign student applicants.

- 2) This is only one of the many reasons why such definitive studies should have the participation and support of institutions other than AGS members and of organizations other than AGS. Among those mentionable are ACE, CGS, ETS, HEGIS, and IIE. The cooperation involved in planning and executing such studies should be expanded to include other aspects of graduate school activity.
- 3) As examples, it might be both desirable and valuable to a) have a central agency in the United States for preliminary screening of applications for admission submitted by foreign students; b) improve the information flow between American graduate schools and foreign institutions from which our students come. (The California State College System is cooperating with IIE in establishing a center for information and study in Lima.); c) design, construct, and operate computer facilities (software and hardware) to consummate b) above; d) explore the desirability of locating Area Studies Centers more rationally in the United States so that instead of there being ten or a dozen centers, all studying the same foreign area complexes and having widely varying characteristics and effectivenesses at one level of total support expenditure, there might be a smaller number of highest quality centers performing the same services at the same or perhaps an even lower level of total support expenditures; e) examine the desirability of opening more liberally the university- and consortium-sponsored overseas centers to American students and faculty outside the sponsoring organizations and to participation and support of other institutions and consortia; f) examine the capabilities and responsibilities of graduate schools to stimulate host communities

to take an active and *appropriate* interest in foreign students and their living and cultural adjustments and experiences during their period of study here; g) determine whether it is appropriate, depending on individual cases, to encourage foreign students to develop competences in specific disciplines but at the same time to maintain contact with their own cultures.

- 4) Every graduate school has had recently (or is having now) some (often unpleasant) experiences due to continuing and prospective significant (or sometimes crippling) decreases in support available for foreign students. The reasons for such decreases vary from decrease to decrease, from institution to institution, and from time to time. They are too familiar to warrant discussion here. However, a specific spurious reason is sometimes advanced: that we as a nation, or as a state, or as a private university or state university must reduce our expenditures for foreign students in order to provide adequate support for our own disadvantaged and minority group students. This suggests that in order to provide for our own students we have to cut off support for foreign students. It is spurious because the entire support from every source for foreign students would take care of only a small fraction of our disadvantaged and minority group students. It is irritating to our disadvantaged and minority group students and to our foreign students because it suggests to them that they should compete, group by group, for a support allotment inadequate for each group separately and therefore totally inadequate for the entirety, as well as that in being set aside, none of them really belongs to the entire community but must be content to occupy peripheral stations. It is a dangerous reason because the several groups and many individuals are (perhaps even more than the graduate schools) fully aware of the meaning and consequences of the reason given. If support for foreign students is reduced, the reasons given should be clear and valid; in no case should they be spurious.
- 5) Some productive attention should be directed toward a definition of the role which graduate study on the part of foreign students here and American students abroad should and should not play in connection with furthering our public policy and national interest.
- 6) Your committee is concerned that the ACE Commission on International Education devoted most of its attention to the education of American students about other cultures rather than to the problems of foreign students in this country. If

this is a precursor of future interests and actions, perhaps there should be some planning and coordination at the national (but not necessarily at the governmental) level. This comment also bears on item number 3. d) above.

LORENE L. ROGERS
S. D. S. SPRAGG
WADE ELLIS, *Chairman*

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

Dean Reginald H. Phelps commented that foreign students and our own minority group students are competing, in graduate schools, not so much for expenditures as for space. That is, as we are reducing the size of our graduate schools, foreign students rather than minority group students are likely to be left out. Dean Ellis agreed that this is a matter of space as well as money.

[The report of the Committee on International Education was accepted.]

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMPUTERS IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

The Committee on Computers, partly in cognizance of the decrease in the funding of the Association, did not hold a meeting this year. But we had a meeting yesterday morning at breakfast, and it was requested that I present the following report.

The Committee on Computers in Graduate Education is aware that there are many problems associated with the funding and use of computers in the universities, but it concludes that most of these current problems lie outside the special domain of the Association of Graduate Schools.

We therefore feel, in the interest of economy of effort and of money, that the Committee should be disbanded as a Committee of the Association of Graduate Schools.

Specific problems which arise in the future should be assigned to ad hoc committees chosen for that particular function.

DANIEL ALPERT

FRANCIS M. BODDY

SANBORN C. BROWN

LYLE V. JONES

HARRISON SHULL, *Chairman*

[The report of the Committee on Computers in Graduate Education was accepted.]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON POLICIES IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

Many of the questions that were discussed by the Committee have come up in this meeting in the last two days, but the Committee has asked that I make two recommendations, essentially to the Executive Committee, but also to the whole group. These are:

(1) That the AGS undertake a study of the over-supply of Ph.D.'s and that this study be made in conjunction with the CGS, if this is appropriate, and with the Office of Manpower of the National Research Council. I think we are already aware of the problem, but this is a specific recommendation asking the Executive Committee to implement some work in this area.

(2) That mechanisms and procedures be established that will provide for better functioning of the Washington office of the AAU with respect to problems of graduate education.

This second recommendation has, of course, to do with Dr. Kidd's efforts. There is no intention on the part of the Committee, however, to criticize the good work that has been done by the AAU Council for Federal Relations Office, but rather a feeling that the views of the graduate deans have not been adequately understood and expressed by the AAU presidents. So I would personally like to underscore what I think is a need for the Executive Committee to work very hard in trying to implement ways of getting our views expressed to the AAU and then through Dr. Kidd's office to the Hill and the White House.

I must say that the forerunner to this is that we ourselves as a group must have much better ideas as to where we want to go and not wait for someone to tell us where to go.

In addition, the Committee has prepared a resolution which has been given to Dean Stone. I will wait until the resolutions are presented should any comments on it be necessary.

AARON LEMONICK
H. W. MAGOUN
STEPHEN SPURR
GEORGE K. FRAENKEL, *Chairman*

SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION

With regard to communication with the Washington office of the AAU, Dean Crawford mentioned that Dr. Kidd's office keeps the president and president-elect of AGS fully informed of its activities and that the president and president-elect are always at least invited to attend both the AAU meetings and the Council on Federal Relations. In addition, about a third

of the members of the Council are graduate deans. The graduate deans who are not on the Council, Dean Crawford suggested, might also be sent those communications regularly sent to Council members which are relevant to graduate education. The real problem, Dean W. Donald Cooke added, is a lack of communication within our own institutions. The AAU presidents, for instance, voted down a number of agenda items proposed by the Council on Federal Relations because they had not discussed the questions with their representatives on the Council. Another problem, according to Dean Crawford, is that Dr. Kidd has difficulty in getting much of a response to some of his inquiries to the member institutions of AAU.

At each AGS institution, Dean D. C. Spriestersbach added, there is an individual, not typically a president, who is a member of the Council on Federal Relations and who should be kept informed of graduate school problems.

[The report of the Committee on Policies in Graduate Education was accepted.]

REPORT OF THE EDITOR

THE JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS

The Journal of Proceedings and Addresses of the Twenty-first Annual Conference of the Association of Graduate Schools in the Association of American Universities was published in October 1970.

Eleven hundred copies were printed. Of these, 552 were distributed as follows: Deans of AGS institutions, 112; Presidents or chief executive officers of AAU-AGS institutions, 55; Libraries of AGS institutions, 56; Deans emeriti of AGS institutions and Associates of AGS, 18; Deans of CGS institutions (excluding AGS members), 236; education associations, foundations, and governmental agencies, 17; foreign libraries, 45; individuals assisting with the *Proceedings*, 13.

In addition to those distributed to the Association and on a complimentary basis, as of 15 October 1970, orders had been placed for 99 copies by the Graduate Deans for their associates and faculties. The list of other orders was undergoing revision at the time of the conference.

EXPENSES

Stenotype Copy	\$ 436.50
Tape Recordings	256.18
Editorial Assistance	645.00
Printing	\$2,738.58
	<hr/>
	\$4,076.26

RECEIPTS

Sale of copies 1 September 1969-31 August 1970 less unpaid invoices and University of Texas Press handling charges	\$ 464.85
--	-----------

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE TREASURER

30 SEPTEMBER 1969 TO 30 SEPTEMBER 1970

Comparative Balance Sheets

<i>Assets, 30 September</i>	<i>1970</i>	<i>1969</i>
Cash in banks		
Checking account	\$ 4,058.19	\$ 2,841.62
Savings accounts	26,696.38	28,852.23
Total Assets	\$30,754.57	\$31,693.85

Fund Equity

Balance, 1 October	\$31,693.85	\$32,890.23
(previous year)		
Cash Increase (Decrease)	(939.28)	(1,196.38)
(see below)		
Balance, 30 September	\$30,754.57	\$31,693.85

Cash Receipts and Disbursements

	<i>Year Ended 30 September 1970</i>	<i>Year Ended 30 September 1969</i>
<i>Receipts</i>		
Dues from member institutions	\$ 5,500.00	\$ 5,500.00
Sales of <i>Proceedings</i>		212.03
Interest on savings accounts	1,245.15	1,370.83
Luncheon tickets	671.50	597.35
Total Receipts	\$ 7,416.65	\$ 7,680.21

Disbursements

Convention Expenses:		
Printing	247.89	283.13
Stenographic	541.58	642.00
Tape Recording	692.68	241.31
Travel and honoraria (guests)	558.58	
Other	2,048.62	1,863.77
Proceedings Expenses		
Printing		2,637.82
Editorial	645.00	615.00
Committee Expenses		
Executive	1,053.72	516.51
Policies in Graduate Education	791.34	700.10

Student Aid		466.15
International Education	612.10	
Membership		472.34
Communication with Public	204.17	
Council on Evaluation of Foreign Student Credentials	55.61	47.46
Offices of the President & Secretary		
Supplies and Printing	136.97	
Secretarial	576.50	110.00
Telephone and Postage	175.45	256.00
Other	15.72	25.00
Total Disbursements	\$ 8,355.93	\$ 8,876.59
Cash Increase (Decrease)	(939.28)	(1,196.38)

[The report was accepted.]

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON NOMINATIONS

The Committee on Nominations reported the following nominations for the officers of the Association of Graduate Schools for 1970-71: for President, W. Donald Cooke, Cornell University; for Vice-President, Robert H. Baker, Northwestern University; for Secretary-Treasurer, Michael J. Brennan, Brown University; for Members-at-Large, F. N. Andrews, Purdue University, and Robert T. Lagemann, Vanderbilt University; for Editor of the *Journal of Proceedings*, William P. Albrecht, University of Kansas.

SANFORD S. ELBERG
JOHN PETERSEN ELDER
JOSEPH L. MCCARTHY, *Chairman*

[The report was accepted and the slate of officers elected unanimously.]

COMMITTEES FOR 1970-71

POLICIES IN GRADUATE EDUCATION

George K. Fraenkel, *Chairman*
Aaron Lemonick
Bryce Crawford, Jr.
Joseph L. McCarthy
Stephen H. Spurr

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

(to serve jointly with
appointees from CGS)
Wade Ellis, *Chairman*
Francis M. Boddy
S. D. S. Spragg

COMMUNICATION WITH THE PUBLIC

D. C. Spriestersbach, *Chairman*
John C. Honey
John C. McKinney
C. W. Minkel
Charles V. Kidd
(AAU Council on Federal Relations)

MEMBERSHIP

Joseph L. McCarthy, *Chairman*
Robert H. Baker

NOMINATIONS

J. Petersen Elder, *Chairman*
Bryce Crawford, Jr.
Sanford S. Elberg

TESTING

Bryce Crawford, Jr., *Chairman*
Michael J. Brennan
Joseph L. McCarthy
Donald W. Taylor
Stephen H. Spurr
John A. Winterbottom
(Educational Testing Service)

PUBLICATIONS

William P. Albrecht, *Chairman*

ACTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Dean Crawford announced that the 1971 Annual Meeting will be held in Minneapolis on 21 and 22 October.

Dean Stone, Chairman of the Resolutions Committee, presented the following resolutions.

(1) *Be it resolved*, that

The Association of Graduate Schools express thanks to the management and staff of the Bonaventure Hotel for its comfortable facilities and excellent service, qualities of hospitality without which a professional meeting can hardly be successful.

[The resolution was passed unanimously.]

(2) *Be it resolved*, that

The Association of Graduate Schools express particular appreciation to Vice-Principal Stanley Frost, Principal Robert E. Bell, Dean Robert V. Nicholls of McGill University, and their staff for making effective local arrangements and providing a quality of hospitality which have assured a successful convocation of deans in times of academic stress and academic planning.

[The resolution was passed unanimously.]

(3) The following resolution was prepared by Dean Fraenkel and his Committee on Policies in Graduate Education.

Whereas, graduate schools are responsible for the education of future generations of scholars and teachers in higher education,

Be it resolved, that

Each graduate school shall continuously reexamine its Ph.D. programs to insure that, to the greatest extent possible, the following conditions be satisfied, and that these conditions be, in addition to those normally required for the Ph.D., and independent of whether or not the institution provides a parallel doctoral program such as the Doctor of Arts:

1. Subject-matter requirements should provide for a broad intra- and interdisciplinary education.
2. Curricula should be designed to provide a thorough grounding in methods and principles that will generate in the student the ability to continue to extend his own knowledge throughout his lifetime.

3. The preparation of the doctoral dissertation should be of direct educational value to the student and should provide experience in the methods of rigorous analysis, as appropriate to the discipline, and provide a contribution to knowledge with substantial intellectual content.

4. Opportunities should be provided for Ph.D. candidates to engage in substantive preparation for teaching as part of their doctoral program. This is particularly important in those disciplines in which most students take up careers in teaching. Programs should be devised whenever possible which allow students to engage in supervised teaching within their own institution.

After some discussion regarding the importance of the resolution, its relation to the joint AGS-CGS publications on the Ph.D. and on professional programs, and the difficulty of endorsing such a complex statement without more time to study it, Dean Crawford ruled that this resolution had been withdrawn by Dean Stone and Dean Fraenkel, and instructed the Executive Committee to mail the resolution to the membership for approval or disapproval of, and appropriate comments on, each of its parts.

(4) *Be it resolved*, that

The assembled deans express concern as to the philosophy which would replace fellowship support grants by a loan program. We urge the Executive Committee to work with the AAU on maintaining a substantial program of direct support such as fellowships.

[The resolution was passed unanimously.]

After the resolutions had been presented, President Crawford thanked his colleagues for their help during the year, and then turned the gavel over to President-Elect W. Donald Cooke. Dean Cooke adjourned the meeting.

THE CONSTITUTION
of
THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS
in the
ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES

I. NAME

This organization is called THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS IN THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN UNIVERSITIES.

II. PURPOSE

It is founded for the purpose of considering matters of common interest relating to graduate study and research.

III. MEMBERSHIP

It is composed of member institutions of the Association of American Universities as of 1948.

Other institutions which have high standards of graduate work at the doctoral level may be added.

IV. MEETINGS

The Association shall hold an annual conference at such time and place as the Executive Committee may direct.

V. OFFICERS

The officers of the Association shall be a President, a President-Elect (who shall serve as Vice-President), and a Secretary-Treasurer, and shall be elected annually.

These three, the immediate Past-President, and two Members-at-Large shall constitute the Executive Committee. The Members-at-Large shall serve two-year terms, one to be elected each year.

The officers, members of the Executive Committee, and members of other committees that may be appointed shall be selected as individuals and not as institutions.

VI. PROGRAM

The Executive Committee shall prepare a program for each meeting.

VII. VOTING POWER

At each conference, each member institution may have any number of representatives, but each member institution shall have a single vote cast by the graduate dean or that officer designated as its representative.

VIII. LIMITATION OF POWERS

No act of the Association shall be held to control the policy or line of action of any member institution. All actions shall be reported to the Association of American Universities.

IX. DUES

Dues are to be determined annually by the Association of American Universities after consultation with the Executive Committee of the Association of Graduate Schools, and shall be collected by the Association of American Universities.

X. ADOPTION AND AMENDMENTS

This constitution shall become effective upon approval in writing by the graduate deans or officers responsible for graduate work in two-thirds of the member institutions of the Association and by approval of the Association of American Universities.

Amendments to this constitution may be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the member institutions of the Association and shall become effective when approved by the Association of American Universities.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION OF
GRADUATE SCHOOLS

1949-71

1949-50

President—Arthur R. Tebbutt; Vice-President—Hugh S. Taylor;
Secretary-Treasurer—N. Paul Hudson

1950-51

President—Hugh S. Taylor; Vice-President—William R. Dennes;
Secretary-Treasurer—N. Paul Hudson

1951-52

President—William R. Dennes; Vice-President—Henry E. Bent;
Secretary-Treasurer—Carl Tolman

1952-53

President—Henry E. Bent; Vice-President—N. Paul Hudson;
Secretary-Treasurer—Carl Tolman

1953-54

President—N. Paul Hudson; Vice-President—David L. Thomson;
Secretary-Treasurer—Carl Tolman

1954-55

President—David L. Thomson; Vice-President—Harold W. Stoke;
Secretary-Treasurer—Ralph E. Cleland

1955-56

President—Harold W. Stoke; Vice-President—Ralph A. Sawyer;
Secretary-Treasurer—Ralph E. Cleland

1956-57

President—Ralph A. Sawyer; Vice-President—Leonard B. Beach;
Secretary-Treasurer—Ralph E. Cleland

1957-58

President—Leonard B. Beach; Vice-President—C. A. Elvehjem;
Secretary-Treasurer—Lewis M. Hammond

1958-59

President—Walter F. Loehwing; Vice-President—A. R. Gordon;
Secretary-Treasurer—Lewis M. Hammond

1959-60

President—J. Petersen Elder; Vice-President—Frederick T. Wall;
Acting Secretary-Treasurer—J. Homer Herriott

1960-61

President—Frederick T. Wall; Vice-President—Moody E. Prior;
Secretary-Treasurer—Everett Walters

1961-62

President—Moody E. Prior; Vice-President—Roy F. Nichols;
Secretary-Treasurer—Everett Walters

1962-63

President—Roy F. Nichols; Vice-President—John C. Weaver;
Secretary-Treasurer—Lewis E. Hahn

1963-64

President—John C. Weaver; Vice-President—R. Bruce Lindsay;
Secretary-Treasurer—S. D. S. Spragg

1964-65

President—R. Bruce Lindsay; Vice-President—Sanford S. Elberg;
Secretary-Treasurer—S. D. S. Spragg

1965-66

President—Sanford S. Elberg; Vice-President—Joseph L. McCarthy;
Secretary-Treasurer—S. D. S. Spragg

1966-67

President—Joseph L. McCarthy; Vice-President—John Perry Miller;
Secretary-Treasurer—S. D. S. Spragg

1967-68

President—John Perry Miller; Vice-President—Frederic Bohnenblust;
Secretary-Treasurer—Daniel Alpert

1968-69

President—Frederic Bohnenblust; Vice-President—Bryce Crawford, Jr.;
Secretary-Treasurer—Daniel Alpert

1969-70

President—Bryce Crawford, Jr.; Vice-President—W. Donald Cooke;
Secretary-Treasurer—Michael Brennan

1970-71

President—W. Donald Cooke; Vice-President—Robert H. Baker;
Secretary-Treasurer—Michael Brennan

MEMBER INSTITUTIONS, DEANS, AND ADDRESSES
THE ASSOCIATION OF GRADUATE SCHOOLS

Brown University—Graduate School
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
401-863-2831
Dean Michael J. Brennan

California Institute of Technology—Graduate Studies
Pasadena, California 91109
213-795-6841
Dean Frederic Bohnenblust

Case Western Reserve University—Graduate Studies
Cleveland, Ohio 44106
216-368-4400
Dean Frank H. Hurley

Catholic University of America—Graduate Studies
Washington, D.C. 20017
202-529-6000
Vice Provost and Dean James P. O'Connor

Clark University—Office of the Graduate School
Worcester, Massachusetts 01610
617-793-7711
Dean Roy S. Anderson

Columbia University—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
New York, New York 10027
212-280-2861
Dean George K. Fraenkel

Cornell University—Graduate School
Ithaca, New York 14850
607-256-4603
Dean W. Donald Cooke

Duke University—Graduate School
Durham, North Carolina 27706
919-684-3913
Dean John C. McKinney

Harvard University—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
617-868-7600 (ext. 2782)
Dean John Petersen Elder

Indiana University—Graduate School
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
812-337-8852
Dean Harrison Shull

Iowa State University—Graduate College
Ames, Iowa 50010
515-294-4531
Acting Vice-President for Research and Dean K. J. Frey

Johns Hopkins University—Faculty of Arts and Sciences
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
301-366-3300 (ext. 611)
Dean George E. Benton

Massachusetts Institute of Technology—Graduate School
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
617-864-6900 (ext. 4869)
Dean Irwin W.Sizer

McGill University—Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
Montreal, Canada
514-392-5106
Acting Dean R.V.V. Nicholls

Michigan State University—Graduate School
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
517-355-0300
Vice-President for Research Development and Dean Milton E. Muelder

New York University—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Washington Square, New York, New York 10003
212-598-2276
Dean George Winchester Stone, Jr.

Northwestern University—Graduate School
Evanston, Illinois 60201
312-492-7264
Dean Robert H. Baker

Ohio State University—Graduate School
Columbus, Ohio 43210
614-422-1679

Vice Provost for Graduate Affairs and Dean Arliss L. Roaden

Pennsylvania State University—Graduate School
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
814-865-6323

Dean James B. Bartoo

Princeton University—Graduate School
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
609-452-3035

Dean Aaron Lemonick

Purdue University—Graduate School
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
317-749-2144

Vice-President for Research and Dean F. N. Andrews

Stanford University—Graduate Division
Stanford, California 94305
415-321-2300 (ext. 2496)

Dean Lincoln E. Moses

Syracuse University—Graduate School
Syracuse, New York 13210
315-476-5541

Executive for Graduate Programs Dr. James W. Harrison

Tulane University—Graduate School
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
504-865-7711 (ext. 7500)

Dean David R. Deener

University of California—Berkeley
Berkeley, California 94720
415-642-5472

Dean Sanford S. Elberg

University of California—Davis
Davis, California 95616
916-752-0650

Dean Allen G. Marr

University of California—Irvine
Irvine, California 92664
714-833-7100

Acting Dean Keith E. Justice

University of California—Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
213-825-4383
Dean Horace W. Magoun

University of California—San Diego
La Jolla, California 92037
714-453-2000
Graduate Studies Dean Herbert F. York

University of California—Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California 93106
805-961-2277
Associate Dean Robert O. Collins
Associate Dean Brian M. Fagan

University of California—Santa Cruz
Santa Cruz, California 95060
408-429-2301
Associate Dean S. M. Williamson

University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois 60637
312-MI-3-0800 (ext. 3013)
Provost John T. Wilson

University of Colorado—The Graduate School
Boulder, Colorado 80304
303-443-2211 (ext. 7401)
Dean C. Lawson Crowe

University of Illinois—The Graduate College
Urbana, Illinois 61801
217-333-0034
Dean Daniel Alpert

University of Illinois at Chicago Circle—The Graduate School
Chicago, Illinois 60680, Box 4348
312-663-3320
Acting Dean Jan Rocek

University of Illinois at the Medical Center—The Graduate College
Chicago, Illinois 60680
312-663-7686
Dean Stephen B. Binkley

University of Iowa—The Graduate College
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
319-353-5534

Vice-President for Educational Development and Research and
Dean D. C. Spriestersbach

University of Kansas—Graduate School
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
913-864-3301

Dean William P. Albrecht

University of Maryland—Graduate School
College Park, Maryland 20742
301-454-3141

Dean Michael J. Pelczar, Jr.

University of Michigan—Horace H. Rackham School of Graduate
Studies

Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
313-764-4400

Dean Stephen H. Spurr

University of Minnesota—Graduate School
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
612-373-2966

Dean Bryce Crawford, Jr.

University of Missouri—Graduate School
Columbia, Missouri 65201
314-449-9236

Dean John C. Murdock

University of Nebraska—Graduate College
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
402-472-2875

Dean Norman H. Cromwell

University of North Carolina—Graduate School
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27514
919-933-1319

Dean Lyle V. Jones

University of Oregon—Graduate School
Eugene, Oregon 97403
503-686-5128

Dean Leona E. Tyler

University of Pennsylvania—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104
215-594-7236
Acting Dean D. J. O'Kane

University of Rochester—University Council on Graduate Studies
Rochester, New York 14627
716-275-4279
Dean S. D. S. Spragg

University of Southern California—Graduate School
Los Angeles, California 90007
213-746-2251
Dean Charles G. Mayo

University of Texas—Graduate School
Austin, Texas 78712
512-471-7213
Dean W. Gordon Whaley

University of Toronto—School of Graduate Studies
Toronto 5, Canada
416-928-2387
Dean W. Douglas Baines

University of Virginia—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
University Station, Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
703-924-3437
Dean W. Dexter Whitehead

University of Washington—Graduate School
Seattle, Washington 98105
206-543-2100
Dean Joseph L. McCarthy

University of Wisconsin—Graduate School
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
608-262-1044
Dean Robert M. Bock

Vanderbilt University—Graduate School
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
615-322-2651
Dean Robert T. Lagemann

Washington University—Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
314-863-0100 (ext. 4551)
Dean Ralph E. Morrow

Yale University—Graduate School
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
203-436-2526
Dean Donald W. Taylor

INDEX

- Association of Graduate Schools: actions and announcements, 93-94; committees (1970-71), 92; constitution, 95-96; delegates and guests, 1-3; financial report, 89-90; membership directory, 99-105; officers and executive committee (present and incoming), vii; officers since 1949, 97-98.
- Business and the educational system (C. W. Cook), 51-57.
- Committees for 1970-71. *See* Association of Graduate Schools.
- Communications with the public, report on: D. C. Spriestersbach, 20; George Arnstein, 21-23; C. David Cornell, 24-31.
- Computers in graduate education, report of committee on, 85.
- Constitution. *See* Association of Graduate Schools.
- Delegates and guests. *See* Association of Graduate Schools.
- Doctor of arts: 11-13, 71, 93-94; luncheon discussions: Irwin W. Sizer, 66; E. P. Bollier, 66-67.
- Employment of Ph.D.'s (luncheon discussion), Roy S. Anderson, 71-72.
- Federal relations, report on: Lloyd G. Humphreys, 8-13; Charles V. Kidd, 14-19.
- Fellowships and traineeships: NSF, 9-13, 69-70, 71; NDEA, 19.
- Financial report. *See* Association of Graduate Schools.
- Graduate education: and the needs of society (O. Meredith Wilson), 57-62; assessment of purposes of (George Winchester Stone, Jr.), 62-65.
- Graduate student organizations. *See* Junior officers of instruction, our.
- International education, report of committee on, 81-84.
- Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, report of editor of, 88.
- Junior officers of instruction, our (panel discussion): Ian C. Loram, 32-36; Francis M. Boddy, 36-41; Elmer F. Baumer, 41-46; C. W. Minkel, 47-50.
- Membership: committee, report of, 80. *See also* Association of Graduate Schools.
- Minority group students (luncheon discussion), Harry G. Yamaguchi, 67-68.
- National Science Foundation: appropriations, 16-19; fellowships and traineeships, 9-13, 69-70, 71.
- Nominations, report of committee on. *See* Association of Graduate Schools.
- Officers. *See* Association of Graduate Schools.
- Policies in Graduate Education, report of committee on, 86-87.
- Post-baccalaureate education (luncheon discussion), Francis M. Boddy, 67.
- President, report by, "The Reasons Why" (Bryce Crawford, Jr.), 5-7.
- Resolutions. *See* Association of Graduate Schools, actions and announcements.
- Student financial aid and federal support: luncheon discussions, Robert H. Baker, 68-69; Martin Chusid, 69-71. *See also* Federal relations, report on, and Fellowships and traineeships.
- Teaching assistants: luncheon discussion, Norman H. Cromwell, 72-73. *See also* Junior officers of instruction, our.
- Testing, report of committee on, 74-79.
- Time for change (panel discussion): C. W. Cook, 51-57; O. Meredith Wilson, 57-62; George Winchester Stone, Jr., 62-65; W. Gordon Whaley, 65.
- Traineeships. *See* Fellowships and traineeships.
- "Turning Point, A," an editorial (W. Donald Cooke), 4.